

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3, The University, Glasgow, W. 2

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. FORDYCE. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.).  
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.  
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.  
F. E. SANDBACH, M.A.

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. XLIX

DECEMBER, 1935

No. 6

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	213
EURIPIDES, <i>Hippolytus</i> 347. W. L. LORIMER	213
THE DRAMATIC DATE OF VARRO <i>Res Rusticae</i> II. J. H. JONES .. .. .	214
VIRGIL, <i>Georgics</i> I. 193-6. S. C. WILLIAMSON	216
SILIUS ITALICUS IN ASIA. W. M. CALDER ..	216
WILHELM SCHULZE. E. FRAENKEL ..	217

### REVIEWS:

*The Odyssey of Homer translated* (Shaw), J. W. MACKAIL, 219; *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus* (Keyssner), R. B. ONIANS, 220; *De dactyloepitritis* (Kolár), H. D. F. KITTO, 221; *Xénophon: La République des Lacédémoniens* (Ollier), E. C. MARCHANT, 222; *Literary Quotation and Allusion in the Rhetoric, Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle* (Hinman), *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius and Longinus* (Apfel), C. G. HARDIE, 222; *Antisthène de la Dialectique* (Kesters), R. HACKFORTH, 223; *Pausanias: Description of Greece, IV and Companion Volume* (Jones and Wycherley), A. M. WOODWARD, 224; *Sextus Empiricus, with an English translation* (Bury), F. H. SANDBACH, 225; *A Greek*

### REVIEWS (continued):

	PAGE
<i>English Lexicon</i> , part 8 (Liddell and Scott), E. HARRISON, 226; <i>Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum</i> (Kirchner), M. N. TODD, 227; <i>Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection</i> (Amundsen), T. C. SKEAT, 228; <i>Ost und West</i> (Ehrenberg), J. L. MYRES, 229; <i>Artemis Ephesia</i> (Thiersch), A. J. B. WACE, 230; <i>By Light, Light</i> (Goodenough), F. H. COLSON, 230; <i>Sallust</i> (Latte), A. H. McDONALD, 231; <i>P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus</i> (Conway), H. E. BUTLER, 232; <i>Religion in Virgil</i> (Bailey), W. R. HALLIDAY, 233; <i>The Manuscripts of Propertius</i> (Ferguson), E. A. BARBER, 234; <i>Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien</i> (Rudolph), R. MEIGGS, 235; <i>Opuscula Archaeologica</i> , vol. i, fasc. 1, R. GARDNER, 237; <i>Der Kölner Münzschatz und vom Jahre 1909</i> (Reusch), H. MATTINGLY, 238; <i>Origins and Development of Applied Chemistry</i> (Partington), K. C. BAILEY, 239; <i>A Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar</i> (Hudson-Williams), R. MCKENZIE .. .. .	239
SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	240
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	244
BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	246
INDEXES .. .. .	247

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.  
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, c/o The Triangle Offices. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. R. M. Rattenbury and Professor T. B. L. Webster) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

Vol. IV (the concluding Volume) in Two Parts

# THE PALACE OF MINOS

A Comparative Account of the Successive Stages of the Early  
Cretan Civilization as illustrated by the Discoveries at Knossos

By SIR ARTHUR EVANS, D.Litt., etc., F.R.S.

With 966 figures in the Text, Plans, Coloured and Supplementary Plates. Crown 4to. £9 9s. net.

Forty years after the beginning of the exploration it has been given to the author to complete this final volume. The work now forms a real Encyclopædia of Minoan art and culture.

"The great work is accomplished, the biggest piece of creative scholarship since the completion of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. For, different in kind as has been the life work of Sir Arthur Evans, in scale, originality, and range of learning it is comparable with that of Gibbon."

Professor W. R. Halliday (*Manchester Guardian*).

"It is impossible to exaggerate our debt to Sir Arthur Evans, and the æsthete as well as the archaeologist will find this great book, now at last completed, packed with fascinating reproductions, and productive of curious speculations."

*New Statesman and Nation*.

\*. \* Illustrated Prospectus post free on application.

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD., ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

t and  
upon  
tional  
(c) to  
create

annual  
of 5s.  
*edings*  
*assical*  
*assical*  
ription  
s paid  
annual

asurer,  
ent to  
e Hon.  
B. L.  
—viz.,  
Anglia,  
Nor-  
effield,  
rset.

S

S.

net.

this

DN

IN  
E  
w  
su  
Jo  
Th  
ele  
w  
lea  
gi  
pr  
on  
th  
G  
ot  
th  
si  
M  
th  
to  
le  
th  
(N  
ta  
pi  
sl

IN  
p  
o  
o  
I  
a  
ti  
a  
a  
c  
A  
la  
s  
th  
a  
F  
t  
d



# The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1935

## NOTES AND NEWS

IN 1921 the Laurentian manuscript of Euripides *plut.* xxxii. 2 (Murray's L) was reproduced in collotype under the supervision and at the expense of Mr. John Alfred Spranger, a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge. Only eleven copies were printed, and none was sold. A condition under which leave for the reproduction had been given was that five copies should be presented to the Laurentian Library; one of them has since found its way to the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (see *Gnomon* II, 1926, pp. 156 f.). Of the other six copies, two were presented to the Libraries of Mr. Spranger's University and College, others to the British Museum, the Bodleian at Oxford, and the Marciana in Venice. With the gift to the Marciana went a request for leave to reproduce in the same manner the Marcianus 471 of Euripides (Murray's M). Consent has been obtained, and fifteen copies of the Euripidean portion of that manuscript will shortly be presented as follows: to the

Cambridge University Library, and the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge; the British Museum, and the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies; the Bodleian; the Rylands Library, Manchester; the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; the Staatsbibliothek, Berlin; the Laurenziana, Florence; Harvard, Yale; and three to the Biblioteca Marciana in fulfilment of the conditions under which reproduction was allowed.

The Classical Association will meet at Westminster School on January 2-4. On the afternoon of the second day the Rt Hon. L. S. Amery will deliver his Presidential Address.

Volume XXVIII (1935) of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* will contain articles on the following subjects: Greek Literature, Latin Literature, Greek History, Roman History, Greek and Roman Religion, Papyri, Latin Palaeography, Greek Archaeology and Excavation.

### EURIPIDES, *HIPPOLYTUS* 347.

ΦΑΙΔΑ. τί τοῦθ' ὃ δὴ λέγουσι ἀνθρώπους ἐρᾶν;

IN a recent review (*C.R.* XLVIII, pp. 221 f.; cf. XLIX, p. 13) I had occasion to touch on the punctuation of this line, but in the effort to be brief I fear I expressed myself too dogmatically. I wish here to justify my objection to the insertion, with Wilamowitz and Professor Murray, of a comma after ἀνθρώπους. I am glad to find I can do so in Socratic fashion παρεχόμενος μάρτυρας αὐτοῦς πρὸς οὓς μοι ὁ λόγος ἐστί. Professor Murray translates 'What is it that they mean, who say men . . . love?' (not 'What is it that they mean, who say men, love?'), and Wilamowitz, explaining that Phaedra hesitates before pronouncing the dread word ἐρᾶν, paraphrases τί δήποτ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ λέγουσι περί

τινων ὅτι—ἐρῶσι (not τί δήποτ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ λέγουσι περί τινων ὅτι, ἐρῶσι). Thus neither has the courage of his comma: each tacitly admits that it is a solecism in typography. There, however, their agreement ends. Wilamowitz equates ὃ λέγουσιν ἀνθρώπους with ὃ λέγουσι περί ἀνθρώπων (I will not stay to question his further equation of ἀνθρώπων with τινῶν). If this were possible, a comma before ἐρᾶν would be in order, but it would not have the function Wilamowitz evidently assigns to his. But in spite of expressions of the type κατὰ λέγω τὸν δαίνα (cf. *E. Hb.* 118 f. εἰ τίς σ' . . . μάταια βάξει) the equation seems to me hardly less *bedenklich* than the statement at the beginning of Wilamowitz's note that apart from the context the

line could mean 'was ist das, was die menschen, wie man sagt, lieben?'—a statement implying that *ἐρᾶν* takes the accusative of the beloved object. Professor Murray, on the other hand, apparently takes *λέγουσιν* as in effect a brachylogy for *λέγουσι λέγοντες* or *λέγοντές φασι* (Pl. *Thi.* 181c<sup>1</sup>). Surely that is the only possible interpretation, whatever be the exact linguistic analysis of the expression (as to which I would suggest that it may be best regarded as an extension of *λέγω mean by* with two accusatives).

I formerly found an identical use of *λέγω* in Pl. *Rp.* 338e: *τοῦτ' οὖν ἐστίν, ὃ βέλτιστε, ὃ λέγω ἐν ἑπάσαις ταῖς πόλεσιν ταῦτόν εἶναι δίκαιον, τὸ τῆς καθεστηκυίας ἀρχῆς συμφέρον.* Jowett so understands *λέγω* there: 'And that is what I mean when I say that in all states there is the same principle of justice, which is the interest of the government.' Cf. also Tucker, whose note, giving the lie to his text, runs thus: "'It is in this sense, then, that I use the expression that 'the same thing is just'" = 'This, then, is what I mean by the same thing being just.' Cf. 332A.' But it seems

fairly clear that *τὸ τῆς καθεστηκυίας ἀρχῆς συμφέρον* is in apposition to *τοῦτ'* and not to anything in the *ὃ* clause, so that, if we take *λέγω* as 'mean by saying,' the translation would rather be 'This, then, is what I mean (refer to) in saying that right is the same thing in all states—the advantage of the established government.' But would not this suggest that Thrasymachus had already stated more explicitly than he has done that right is the same thing in all states? It seems better on the whole to translate 'This, then, my good sir, is what I affirm right to be, one and the same (=identically, alike), in all states, viz., the advantage of the established government.' So Apelt, Shorey, Chambry. This quasi-adverbial use of *ὁ αὐτός* is of course idiomatic; cf. E. *Hr.* 348 *ἡδιστον, ὃ παῖ, ταῦτόν ἀλγεινόν θ' ἅμα*: Pl. *Rp.* 564b *ἡρώτας . . . ποῖον νόσημα ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ τε φυόμενον ταῦτόν καὶ ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ δουλοῦται αὐτήν*: Pl. *b.* 13b *τί οὖν δὴ ταῦτόν ἐν ταῖς κακαῖς ὁμοίως καὶ ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐνὸν πάσας ἡδονὰς ἀγαθὸν εἶναι προσαγορεύεις*; But though I feel I must withdraw the remark that the interpretation of *λέγουσιν* in E. *Hr.* 347 as 'mean by saying' is supported by Pl. *Rp.* 338e, I do not think the interpretation itself open to doubt.

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

#### THE DRAMATIC DATE OF VARRO *RES RUSTICAE*, BOOK II.

THE dialogue of the second book of the *Res Rusticae* begins very abruptly. The speakers are not introduced as in I and III, while the setting of the dialogue is in no way specified. Varro's practice in the other two books makes it improbable that he plunged in *medias res*, and so most critics suppose a lacuna at the end of the preface. The cryptic words *hic intermisimus*<sup>1</sup> may then be taken as a scribe's indication of this gap. The time and place of the dialogue have accordingly to be ascertained from indications in the text itself.

At the conclusion of the preface Varro writes:—'*de re pecuaria breuiter ac*

summam percurram ex sermonibus nostris collatis cum iis qui pecuarias habuerunt in Epiro magnas, tum cum piratico bello inter Delum et Siciliam Graeciae classibus praeessem.' The year is therefore 67 B.C. But it is Varro's custom to specify a definite occasion within the year, just as in I the dialogue is set at the *feriae sementinae* of 67, and in III at the election of aediles in 54 B.C. The reference to the Pirate War does in fact limit the time to March, April, May, or early June; for the war lasted only three months, Pompey proceeding at once to dispossess Metellus in Crete and to winter in Asia. Varro is still *ποιμὴν λαῶν* (II. 5. 1) at the time of the dialogue;

<sup>1</sup> R.R. II, *praef.* 6.

his command has not yet expired. But probably the date can be fixed yet more closely. In II. 5. 1 Lucienus fetches Murrius to go with him, 'dum asses soluo Palibus'. The last word is obviously corrupt and various conjectures have been proposed, of which the Aldine's *Palilibus* or Schneider's *Pali* appears to be more probable than Keil's *Laribus*.<sup>1</sup> Probably therefore the dramatic date of the book is the *Palilia* or *Parilia*, i.e. April 21st, 67 B.C. Mr. Storr-Best's arguments for this date are very convincing, even if his ingenious reconstruction of the action of the book cannot be accepted without reserve. The atmosphere is that of a holiday; there is a sacrifice to be made (8. 1), and the speakers meet *ad constitutum* (5. 1), while they break up at the advent of a summons from Vaccius, 'ne diem festum faceres breuiorem' (II. 12). Ovid (*Fasti* iv. 774) mentions the *liba* paid to Pales which Menates' freedman declares have been paid (8. 1). Finally, Pales was a pastoral goddess, so that her festival was a suitable occasion for a discussion *de re pecuaria*.<sup>2</sup> This date besides would lend interest to Varro's discourse on the dignity of the pastoral life and to his statement 'quod Parilibus potissimum condidere urbem' (II. 1. 9).

There are moreover some chronological indications that confirm the claim of the *Parilia*. Varro's movements are fairly well known during this year 67. He was one of Pompey's *legati* in the campaign against the pirates. Now Pompey set sail from Rome, according to Cicero, 'nondum tempestiuo ad nauigandum mari' (*de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 34), a date fixed by Rice Holmes (*Rom. Rep.* I, p. 174, n. 2) as being before March 10th. The war fell into two parts, of which the first effected the expulsion of the pirates from the Western Mediterranean in forty days,<sup>3</sup> after which Pompey returned

to Rome, sending on his army and fleet to Brundisium (Plut., *Pomp.* 27, 1). The first part of the war came to an end, then, about forty days after March 10th, i.e. on April 18th or 19th. This is a date two or three days before the most probable date of this dialogue. The *Parilia* therefore must have fallen in the interval while Pompey was at Rome. Varro has not yet joined the muster for the second and decisive campaign in Cilicia, but has remained in his headquarters in Corcyra (cf. *R.R.* I. 4. 5) enjoying a well earned rest after the blockade of the pirates. Atticus and other Romans who own estates in Epirus have joined him, and a discussion on farming takes place which forms the kernel of our Book II. Thus the meeting on the *Parilia* is possible and even probable, dovetailing neatly into what is known of the events of this spring.

The statement of the preface quoted above, 'ex sermonibus nostris collatis cum iis qui pecuarias habuerunt in Epiro magnas,' demands more attention. It implies that the dialogue is based on these real conversations, the sources in fact described by Varro as 'quae a peritis audii' (*R.R.* I. 1. 11). If the dialogue is not a report of a conversation, at least such a conversation lies behind it. It is natural therefore to find Varro speaking of his estates at Reate and in Apulia (II. 2. 9), and of his Liburnian campaign (10. 8). Further, the lively movement in and out throughout the discussion, together with its continuous good humour, gives a further impression of reality. In the *De Vita Sua* Varro wrote his autobiography, in which the events of this year must have figured prominently. Perhaps the settings of the *Res Rusticae* are derived from this work. Varro, writing some thirty years after the Pirate War, referred to this work to secure the utmost dramatic truth. Thus he found accounts of the meeting with Appius Claudius in the Villa Publica, of that with Fundanius in the Temple of Tellus, and of that with Atticus in Corcyra. For the last indeed the evidence is very suggestive. Varro based his narrative on a real meeting of April 21st, 67 B.C.

J. HENRY JONES.

University College, London.

<sup>1</sup> Keil compares Varro, *De Vita P. R.* ap. Non. p. 531. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Frazer on Ovid *Fasti* iv. 721.

<sup>3</sup> Livy's 40 days for the whole war (*Epit.* 99) is clearly wrong. But his 40 with Cicero's 49 make 89 days, i.e. Plutarch's οὐκ ἐν πλείονι χρόνῳ τριῶν μηνῶν. The view of the war here followed is that of Groebe in *Klio* x (1910), pp. 374-389.

VIRGIL, *GEORGICS* I. 193-196.

*Semina vidi equidem multos medicare serentes,  
et nitro prius et nigra perfundere amurca,  
grandior ut fetus siliquis fallacibus esset,  
et, quamvis igni exiguo, properata maderent.*

THE accepted interpretation seems to be, 'I have indeed seen many sowers doctoring the seeds, steeping them first with soda manure and dark oil lees, so that the produce should be bigger in the deceiving pods and they should boil quickly though the fire be small.' All school editions take it in this manner, notably T. E. Page's, and Smith's Dictionary quotes this passage as an example of *maderere* 'to be boiled.' There is, however, the difficulty of *properata* being in agreement with *semina*, and the seed beans are obviously not to be boiled. The editors, seeing this, suggest that *properata* refers to the ripe new beans, being the *semina* grown up. This is most unlikely, particularly as Virgil has deliberately used the word *fetus* in the line above for the new bean in the pod, that is, the only bean that can be boiled.

Virgil is here writing about the growing of leguminous plants and not about the cooking of pea-soup. It is unlikely that *maderent* means 'boil' here at all. I think help can be got for interpreting this passage if we go to the practical farmer. I have asked a Kentish grower whether he ever treated his seed beans with artificial liquid manure. His reply may be summarized, 'No. We might get bigger fruit (*grandior*), but they would come up too quickly (*properata*), though the weather wasn't very warm (*quamvis igni exiguo*), and the late frosts would ruin them because they would be

too lishy.' I asked him what 'lishy' meant. It is a Kentish word meaning wet and juicy (*maderent*). The Italian farmer did not have to worry over the susceptibility of his plants to the May frosts to the same extent as the Kentish man, so could and did use liquid manure on his seed beans. So the passage might be rendered, 'I have indeed seen many sowers doctoring the seeds, steeping them first with soda manure and dark oil lees, so that the produce should be bigger in the deceiving pods and they should quickly grow juicy though the sun's heat be scanty.' *Ignis* is of course used for the heat of the sun elsewhere, and there is, I think, a good reason for Virgil's use of the word here. *Properata maderent* refers to the growth of the plants, but is appropriately connected with *semina* because Virgil was thinking of the growth from the moment the seeds sprouted, in the same sense as Pliny wrote *radix suco madet*. So *maderent* might almost be translated 'germinate.' This meaning would have been clearer to a Roman reader than to a modern because of the biological background. Educated people in Virgil's day thought that germination and life had to do with the elements. In the case of a plant two of the elements were presupposed and passive. The seed lay in the earth and was to grow to the air. As Virgil was considering the active process of growth, he referred to the two active elements, the water that became sap and the fire of the sun's rays.

S. C. WILLIAMSON.

Faversham Grammar School, Kent.

## SILIUS ITALICUS IN ASIA.

IN May of 1934, when the American Society's survey of the monuments of Aphrodisias in Caria appeared to be nearing an end, I made a three days' excursion to Attouda in Phrygia, leaving my companions J. B. Birnie and L. I. Highby to search the fields and vineyards around the city walls for stray monuments. Their search added nearly fifty to the 185 stones we had already

recorded, and the fifty included an inscription which we should have been sorry to miss.

About 3 km. from the western wall of Aphrodisias, at a point bearing 255° from the Acropolis, Mr. Highby came upon a broken cistern, built by a former Dere Bey of blocks taken from the site of Aphrodisias. Lying beside it was the top of a marble basis, broken across

the shaft (height, m. 0'37; width, m. 0'53; thickness, m. 0'56; letters, m. 0'02 to 0'025). The basis was inscribed as follows:

[Τι]βέριος Κάτιος Ἀσκλη-  
 νιος Σείλιος Ἰταλικὸς  
 ἀνθύπατος λέγει· κα[ι]  
 ψηφισμάτων δυναν  
 5 καθὰ κωλύεται συναμ-  
 βάν[ειν] τρέφειν σοβεῖν  
 [. . . . .] ἐν τῇ πόλει τὰς  
 [περιστερὰς] τῆς τε θρησ-  
 [κείας τῆς πε]ρὶ τὴν θεόν  
 . . . . .

Below ΝΘΕ in l. 9 we distinguished an upper horizontal bar followed by Ο (or Θ) and Λ (or Α or Δ). Perhaps . . . σθα[ι].

When we returned home we discovered that we had been the first to read the name of the Roman poet Silius Italicus, as he himself signed it. He was proconsul of Asia ca. A.D. 77. The inscription raises questions of genealogy

and local connection which merit the attention of experts in North Italian epigraphy, possibly also of students of the *Punica*.

Doves still coo around the ruined temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias, and the verb σοβεῖν imposes the restoration [περιστερὰς], which exactly fits the space, in l. 8. In l. 7, assuming that ἐν τῇ πόλει is correctly restored, there remains a space to fill exactly equivalent to that occupied by ΒΑΝΕΙΝ in l. 6. I had been tempted to restore [πωλεῖν ἐν] here, but the prohibition to sell comes awkwardly after σοβεῖν. 'To catch and to keep, to scare and to . . . ?'

The words ἐν τῇ πόλει appear to limit the application of the ψηφίσματα (of the local βουλή) to the space within the city walls.

A pretty episode in the life of a poet.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

#### WILHELM SCHULZE.

IN January 1935 one of the greatest scholars of the last few generations died in Berlin. His death, however, has not made the impression that might have been expected. But possibly this very inconspicuousness is appropriate to the austere and noble character and the profound modesty of Wilhelm Schulze. Never would he have done anything for the sake of fame; he devoted years of hard work to stir and support the work of his fellow scholars, and the wise saw 'Cast thy bread upon the waters' could be regarded as the maxim of his life.

This is not the proper place, nor is it within the reach of the present writer, to gauge Schulze as a comparative philologist. All that can be attempted here is roughly to outline the bearing of his work on the general study of Greek and Latin and thus to emphasize the most important section of his widespread activity. A strong humanistic feeling was the innermost core of his amazing manysidedness: 'An der Sprache Homers habe ich zuerst das Problem der sprachgeschichtlichen Entwicklung zu ahnen begonnen, und wenn ich auch lockenden Seitenwegen

nicht immer widerstanden habe, bin ich im Herzen doch den Griechen treu geblieben, deren Sprache mir, ich frage nicht ob mit Recht oder mit Unrecht, heut wie immer als die höchste Manifestation des sprachbildenden Menschengeistes erscheint' (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 47).

Schulze's reputation was founded by the *Quaestiones Epicae* published when he was twenty-seven. The effect of this book may best be described by the words of Walter Leaf: 'Schulze's important work must beyond question form the foundation of any future inquiries into the matters with which it deals.' Its chief problem is the nature of *productio metrica*, but it covers a much larger field. Never before had an investigation of significant elements of a poetical *Kunstsprache* been carried out with so complete an instrument of both linguistic and literary knowledge. The combination of *Sprachgeschichte* and *classische Philologie* achieved in the works of Wilhelm Schulze and Jacob Wackernagel, though it does not seem to appeal very much to the taste of a younger generation, cannot be abandoned without serious loss.



Twelve years after the *Quaestiones Epicae* Schulze published the huge volume *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, the masterly achievement of his mature age. Here, to a much higher degree than in the former book, he left the beaten track and developed methods of research so entirely new that one is tempted to speak of a revolution. He used the analysis of certain small and, as it might seem, unimportant elements in the formation of proper names as the most effective tool to unearth almost inaccessible strata of the history not only of Rome, but of early Italy as a whole. This work, written during the last few years of Mommsen's lifetime, is the most admirable product of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*; for without the laborious bulk and the elaborate arrangement of the *Corpus* the whole scheme of Schulze's research would have been impossible. But he has fully repaid his debt to the great historian by the use he has made of the epigraphical material. Nowadays no history of ancient Italy can be written, no problem of early Roman religion can be seriously discussed, without ample reference to the *Lateinischen Eigennamen*. The inestimable value of this work is not impaired by the fact that certain scholars take advantage of its contents in a manner contrary to the author's intentions and, blinded by a kind of Panetruscism, misrepresent as strict evidence what was partly meant to be material for cautious examination. Schulze's genius, through the medium of language, always grasped the essential features of cultural life, and therefore his study of Greek concentrated in Homer, and, when concerned with the language of Rome, he was conducted to history.

A no less important, though less known, part of Schulze's work consists of his numerous shorter and longer articles. Most of them have been reprinted in a volume published a short time before his death.<sup>1</sup> These 'Kleine Schriften' have a just claim to a place in the library of every classical scholar. They equal his large books in perfect

scholarship and originality, but are far superior in spontaneous life and literary grace. The thing which first strikes the reader is the enormous range of the author's learning. It is as though he had wandered over the whole area of Indo-European literatures, from the Rigveda down to modern novels. Another striking quality is the intensity of his reading: he does not seem to skip anything. Out of two lines of p. xlvii of Mommsen's preface to the edition of Jordanes he draws an unknown Old High German gloss of first-rate linguistic importance (p. 65). Still even more significant is the general trend of his research. With Schulze and with a few of his contemporaries the so-called Comparative Philology became a thing wholly different from what it had been before. He more and more shifted his ground from the nebulous spaces of prehistory to the solid soil of historic development and thus, without disparaging the inherited methods, turned 'Sprachvergleichung' into 'Sprachgeschichte'. His new position appears not only in his blaming the etymologists, 'deren Interesse leider fast mehr den erschlossenen "Wurzeln" gilt als den fertigen Wörtern der lebendigen Sprache' (p. 218), but in almost every page of his work. Yet he proceeded still further. Enthusiast as he was for sober grammatical research, he nevertheless regarded even 'Sprachgeschichte' not as an end in itself but as a means of securing evidence for history in general. In this he is unique. Future generations will possibly range this grammarian among the great historians of the period of Mommsen. He possessed an extraordinary ability of entering into the feelings of men who lived thousands of years ago under conditions entirely different from those of modern civilization, and the strength and simplicity of his own nature linked those bygone people to him by bonds of unconscious sympathy. One cannot help feeling sorry for the many classical scholars who are still unfamiliar with the 'Beiträge zur Wort- und Sittengeschichte', published first in 1918 (now reprinted, p. 148 ff.). These three articles are as indispensable for a study of Homer

<sup>1</sup> *Kleine Schriften* von Wilhelm Schulze (Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, Göttingen).

and Greek tragedy as for that of Roman poets, while at the same time they most successfully trace back fundamental habits and institutions of the European nations to the remotest past. And the same applies to the paper 'Der Tod des Kambyses' (p. 131 ff.), which is remarkable, too, for a noble sense of the heroic outlook on life. Henceforth even schoolboys may be taught what the strange phrase *suum diem obire* really means, as from another article ('Die lateinischen Buchstabennamen', p. 444 ff.) their master may tell them why we pronounce *be* and *ce*, but *el* and *em*. But to return once more to the bearing of Schulze's work on history: fertile as it is of information on early stages of European culture, it is also highly instructive with respect to the period of late antiquity and the first dawns of the Middle Ages. Here it may suffice to mention the thorough discussion of the original meaning of *paganus* (p. 519 ff.) and the article *Gotica I*, where there is to be found an extremely valuable account of the

part played by the Goths in propagating Arianism and carrying forward the tradition of Greek ecclesiastical language, and where, furthermore, the compass of their practical knowledge of geography is stated (p. 526 f., 533).

To those editors of Latin texts who continue spelling *Erichthonius* and *Phthius* (instead of *Erichthonius*, *Pthius*), against the authority of the inscriptions and all the older manuscripts, it might be useful to consult sometimes Schulze's famous *Orthographica* (Marburg, 1894), which, incidentally, reveals a comprehensive knowledge of the manifold studies of the Middle Ages. I very much regret that neither this paper nor *Graeca Latina* (Göttingen, 1901) has been reprinted in the recently published collection, but I hope that these articles too will be read and appreciated by all those who have experienced the power of Schulze's scholarship when reading his *Kleine Schriften*.

EDUARD FRAENKEL.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

## REVIEWS

### THE AIRCRAFTSMAN'S ODYSSEY.

T. E. SHAW (Colonel T. E. LAWRENCE): *The Odyssey of Homer translated*. Pp. iv+327. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1935. Buckram, 10s. 6d.

THIS singular work, the appearance of which was so elaborately heralded, is of special interest for the light it throws on the psychology of its author, but of further value in forcing consideration of what is meant, at the present day and to the modern mind, by a classic, and by poetry. What a translator provides is an interpretation of the work which he translates. The limits within which he works are set, first by the degree and quality of his appreciation of the original, and secondly by the amount of this appreciation that he can put into his own language. The result is, in its way, a work of art; but it is in any case at a twofold remove from the work of art on which it is

based. In assessing the value of any rendering of the poetry of one language with the prose of another, what must be regarded is the purpose aimed at. It may be a frank crib, not attempting to convey more than the equivalent of words and phrases as they yield themselves to a grammar and a dictionary. It may make the further attempt at doing this with such skill as makes it capable of being read with pleasure and interest for its own sake. Or it may, theoretically at least, have infused into it a definite artistic quality, and be a work of art of a real, though a secondary and derivative kind.

When that distorted genius, Samuel Butler, produced his prose version of the *Odyssey* some thirty years ago, he claimed that there was then in existence no translation which was readable or even tolerable. That version, or perversion, fell dead. In his curious and

provocative preface, Lawrence claims for his own that it is 'essentially straightforward.' What vitiates his treatment is his attitude of unaccountable belittlement, almost amounting to contempt, of the original. For him, after four years of 'living with it,' the *Odyssey* is 'Wardour Street Greek'; 'as nearly word-perfect as midnight oil and pumice can effect,' 'worth reading for its story,' but 'missing every chance of greatness': 'any big situation is burked, and the writing is soft, the characterisation thin and accidental.' Its author is 'a lover of old bric-a-brac,' 'a muddled antiquary,' 'very bookish,' with 'the fixed grin of archaism.' Of the three central characters, Odysseus is for him a cold-blooded egotist, Penelope a sly cattish wife, Telemachus a prig; no more than that. For the best part of three thousand years, this has not been the judgment of the world; nor is it likely to be.

The straightforwardness claimed for the translation must be taken with important reservations. In poetry (as indeed in all work, prose or verse, which is in the full sense literature) matter and form are inseparable. One instance may suffice. The formula line *ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἠώς* occurs nineteen times in the *Odyssey*; its use is part of the essential epic structure, and no less so is its deliberate repetition. It is rendered here in eighteen different ways, ranging from drawn-out paraphrases like 'Day-break: and the rosy-tinted fringes of dawn crept up the sky,' to the mere epitome 'At dawn.' Lawrence might have argued that his rendering in each case was straightforward in the sense that it represented the effect that the line of Homer had on him on each of its occurrences; but to an English reader who does not know Greek, the

distinctive Homeric quality disappears. This holds good of formulaary words as well as formulaary lines: some variation here is defensible, and may even now and then be inevitable, but when we find at least eight varieties of an English rendering of the epithet *ξανθός*, we cannot help feeling that here too the Homeric quality, the epic sense of language, is lost.

It is to students and scholars that the book may be of real use. Lawrence was himself a competent scholar; of actual mistranslations there are very few; two may be noticed in *η* 135 and *υ* 297, and by rendering *δείπνον* and *δάρπουν* in *υ* 390, 392 by 'meal' and 'banquet,' the meaning of one of the most splendid passages in the *Odyssey* is obliterated. But many renderings which may seem wild will be found on reflection to be due not to misconception of the Greek, but to underlining and making explicit something which is implied or suggested in the original: 'He cleared his throat and said' (*φθεγγάμενος προσήνδα*), 'Heaven and hell!' (*ὦ πόποι*), 'here Odysseus broke off his history' (*ὡς ἔφαθ'*), are faults of taste, not of scholarship. Homer is never grotesque. So too with the ultra-modernisations which occur on almost every page, like 'your partiality must not flatter me' (*σ* 178), 'to be sceptical and to reject the evidence' (*υ* 335), 'held a place in society' (*σ* 138). It is very easy even for accomplished Hellenists to read Greek poetry superficially, and not to hear the undertones, to respond to the suggestions, to feel the delicate complexity which underlies its accurate beauty and apparent simplicity. But the study of these in the *Odyssey* would be wasted if it did not leave unimpaired, even heightened, admiration of its exquisite artistry and steady magnificence.

J. W. MACKAIL.

#### GOD AND MAN IN THE GREEK HYMN.

KARL KEYSSNER: *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*. Pp. xvi + 172. (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, 2. Heft.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Paper, M. 12.

WHEN a man prays, he is apt to reveal what he desires, what he fears, and incidentally how he conceives of his god. This is true of the formal and public prayers of the Greeks which have come down to us in the shape of 'hymns.'

Herr Keyssner examines and analyses the relevant formulae, which recur with variations, and seeks the thought behind. He is not concerned with the individual elements in the hymns or with the myths associated with particular gods. There is much to be said for studying thus the habits of thought and expression within a particular literary form.

He relates the formulae of beginning (*ἄρχεσθαι*) to the conception of the gods as beginnings. Then he illustrates 'the hyperbolic style,' the attribution of universal power and of eternity to the particular god who is occupying the attention, and he examines the various expressions for the power of the gods (*δύναμις*, *ἀρετή*, *κράτος*, etc.) with its symbols (sceptre, key, and seal), and the correlative sense of man's dependence. Next he lists the various words implying the mercy and goodwill of the gods to men (*εὐμενής*, *εὐφρων*, *ἱλαος*, etc.), noting the natural emphasis in prayer upon this aspect, then the words describing the activities of the gods towards men (*ἐπιφανής*, *ἐπήκοος*, *ἐπίσκοπος*,

*σωτήρ*, etc.), then various anthropomorphic aspects of the gods. The second and much shorter section examines the *Lebensauffassung*, the objects of desire: long life, health, wealth, freedom from trouble, joy, etc. for the individual; good children for the family; peace, justice, etc. for the state. From the uses of *ἑσθλός*, *ἀγαθός*, *καλός*, *ἀρετή*, *εὐδοξος*, etc. he infers that an ethical element was included in the values prayed for. Finally, he relates the conception of the gods to those ideals for men.

Within these limits the work is well done, though there are points where the argument is not clear and the analysis of thought has less value than it might, since it does not, except occasionally, show the development in time, nor is it related to the evidence of other forms of literature. Suggestions for the text are made in a number of defective or corrupt passages. There is an index.

R. B. ONIANS.

University College, Swansea.

#### DACTYLOEPITRITES.

A. KOLÁŘ: *De dactyloepitritis*. Pp. 87. (Opera facultatis philosophicae Universitatis Comenianae Bratislavenensis, n. XVII.) Bratislava, 1935. Paper, Kč 33.

IN his second book<sup>1</sup> Kolář argues (a) that the ionic theory is untenable and (b) that these rhythms are 'logaoedicis propinquos et pariter metiendos'. Schröder, trying to get uniformity by reducing all feet to six-time, creates chaos by admitting anywhere any form of six-time foot, 'nulla ratione formae illorum pedum habita': even this he cannot do without hypercatalexis and seven-time ionic, and his colometry is artificial. Král (Schroederianus) is similarly criticized: but is this sound criticism of a theory which uses prolongations and final rests (i.e. | - u | - |  $\frac{x}{x}$  |): 'quod quia saepissime faciendum est suspicionem movet'? If such cadences were used at all, the odd thing would be rarity, not frequency.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vid. C.R. 1935, pp. 63-4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gomme's wise remarks on bread, J.H.S. LIII (1933), p. 22.

Kolář's Dorian, like his logaoedics, consists of a blend of three- and four-time feet, rising or falling: there is however regularity of ictus, obtained by a constantly changing tempo:  $\overset{a}{\text{P}} \text{P} \text{P}$ , or

$\overset{a}{\text{P}} \text{P}$ . All extant Dorian strophes are analysed, mainly into anapaestic or dactylic tripodies or tetrapodies and iambic or trochaic dipodies. The choriambus is admitted; there is no epitrite. Throughout are found logaoedic phrases (e.g. - - u -  $\frac{u}{u}$ ) which indicate the propinquity of the rhythms.

Though sharing several of Kolář's heresies, I do not find his theory convincing. The jerks from rising to falling rhythm are surely as unlikely as the jumble of feet to which he objects in the ionic theory. Some of the verse-divisions are astonishing: if the writers of the fragments on pp. 33 and 35 really followed the principle of having a word-ending, with punctuation if possible, after the first syllable of every verse but the first, they were singularly poor rhythmists; and not a few of the

logaoedic phrases seem to be nothing but 'epitrites' wrongly divided. I raise these three points because they proceed from one assumption, which Koláf shares with most metrists, that the beginning of a rhythmical phrase (verse) must coincide with the beginning of one of its constituent feet. Is there any reason for believing this, in face of the difficulties it makes? I know Hephaestion did, but he would believe anything.

However, this is an interesting piece of work. I apologize for using the term 'Dorian', but if 'Chalcidian' is a 'nomen ineptum nihilque explicans', 'dactyloepitrite' incorrect as well as clumsy, and 'Dorian' 'multo ineptius', what is one to do? I, for one, prefer picturesque ineptitude to definite inaccuracy.

H. D. F. KITTO.

*University of Glasgow.*

#### XENOPHON ON SPARTA.

F. OLLIER: *Xénophon, La République des Lacédémoniens*. Texte et traduction avec une introduction et un commentaire. Pp. xlv+81. Lyons: Bosc, 1934. Paper.

M. OLLIER says that to get at the truth about what Xenophon relates of the Spartan constitution, it is necessary to complete his indications, to restore to each detail its real importance, and to depose the Spartans from the pedestal on which he has perched them. This he has done in the commentary, which resembles a first-rate course of college lectures. He has also tried to remove the obscurities due to X.'s brevity or clumsiness, and to substitute, where possible, the explanations of Spartan institutions which modern historians or he himself judges probable. He has collected a great amount of useful information scattered up and down in ancient authors and in modern histories, articles and dissertations.

He generously says that he has read my translation with profit. I cordially return the compliment: after reading his version with his comments I should, had I the opportunity, alter mine in some important details.

I am unable to share his views of the

origin and purpose of this second-rate production. He thinks that X. had a political purpose, that he produced in a hurry a manifesto addressed to the Greek world to justify the continuance of the Spartan hegemony. It was issued immediately—in 394 or shortly after. The mysterious palinode was not published in X.'s life-time, and was found written in the margin of his copy after his death.

But if X. is trying to enlist the support of waverers, why does he not say so? Concealment of his purpose is quite unlike him. Why is he not as explicit as Isocrates in the *Panegyricus*? He professes merely to be explaining a paradox (i, 1), and why not take this simple gentleman at his word? Dakyns was probably nearer the mark in supposing that the pamphlet was not published until after its author's death: his purpose is didactic, not political. Some of the details on which X. dwells seem clearly out of place in a work of political propaganda.

M. Ollier is not primarily interested in the text; but he has contributed a few good suggestions for its improvement.

E. C. MARCHANT.

*Lincoln College, Oxford.*

#### QUOTATION IN ARISTOTLE AND OTHERS.

W. S. HINMAN: *Literary Quotation and Allusion in the Rhetoric, Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. Pp. 200. Wagner College, Staten Island, N.Y., 1935. Paper, \$1.50 (cloth, 2).

HENRIETTA VEIT APFEL: *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius περὶ ῥητορίας and Longinus περὶ*

*ὑψους*. Pp. vii+123. (Columbia University, New York, 1935.) Paper, \$1.50.

THESE two 'partial fulfilments of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D. in Columbia University' are laborious and conscientious compilations. But it may be doubted how far the process



of compilation is instructive to the compiler or leads to results of value in themselves or as a basis for later work. Scattered impressions and observations are catalogued and enumerated, but little more is achieved than to index and accumulate the obvious. In quotations, as we know, Aristotle was always strictly relevant, and illustrated his point with one word, if that would recall the passage, without consideration for the beauties of expression of the complete passage. But it is hardly permissible to infer, as Mr. Hinman does, that Aristotle lacked 'the first requirement of a great literary critic—an intuitive apprehension of the beauty of expression and an immediate perception of literary values.'

Though it is perhaps significant that he quotes Aeschylus hardly ever and the Homeric Hymns never, his taste in literature can hardly be inferred by the necessarily fragmentary method of examining only his so jejune relevant quotations. For Aristotle's accuracy of quotation, where it can be tested, Mr. Hinman gives the figure of 61 per cent. But his criterion of accuracy is curious. Aristotle is counted as inaccurate where he quotes Euripides *Iph. Taur.* 727 as *πολύθυροι διαπρυχαί* (the accepted reading which we owe to this quotation) because the MSS. read the impossible

*πολύθρηνοι*; or again he seems to get a bad mark because the best MS. of the *Poetics* reads *ἴωνες βόωσι* for *ἡόνες βόωσι*, which Aristotle clearly wrote. These examples are not isolated and Aristotle is, in substance, much more accurate than Mr. Hinman's 61 per cent.

It is not reassuring when Mr. Hinman suggests that the line *Ζεὺς γὰρ οἱ νεμέσασχ' ὅτ' ἀμείνονι φωτὶ μάχοιτο* might be Aristotle's own comment on the previous line, or describes Democritus' *Μελήσιοι ἀξύνετοι μὲν* as a 'song.'

Little new emerges from Miss Apfel's work on the treatises of 'Demetrius' and 'Longinus.' They are much less accurate than Aristotle, but would probably have been indifferent if told so. The opinions of many scholars are diligently compiled on each point, but are counted rather than weighed. The treatments of Theodorus and Caecilius are mere aggregates of notes. No new light is thrown on the date of the treatises, and c. 44 of the *περὶ ὕψους* on the lack of freedom as the cause of the contemporary decay of literature is not adduced.

One wonders what proportion of the total requirements of a Ph.D. is formed by these uninspired machine-made products.

C. G. HARDIE.

*British School at Rome.*

#### ECCE ITERUM ANTISTHENES.

H. KESTERS: *Antisthène de la Dialectique: étude critique et exégétique sur le XXVI<sup>e</sup> discours de Thémistius*. Pp. 236. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1935. Paper, 50 francs.

DR. KESTERS here gives us an elaborate analysis of Themistius' oration *ὑπὲρ τοῦ λέγειν*, with the object of substantiating the theory put forward in his earlier studies. The speech, he maintains, is the lost work of Antisthenes *περὶ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι*, served up by Themistius as his own with quite trifling modifications: 'here and there he has suppressed or changed a word, glossed an expression that had become unintelligible: he has changed the proper names and applied his laws of rhythm in order to conceal his fraud' (p. 9).

This thesis, sufficiently startling in itself, involves certain corollaries hardly less so: for example, that *Phaedrus* 272c-end is an appendix added by Plato in a later edition for the purpose of refuting the present speech of Antisthenes, and that the *Protagoras* is later than the *Phaedrus*. Further, we are required to accept Krohn's dismemberment of the *Republic*, in which Books V-VII were inserted, according to Dr. Kesters, to refute Antisthenes' contention (in this speech) that Plato had been false to his own doctrines.

I do not propose to examine the author's arguments in detail, since this imposing structure is manifestly built on sand. In the first place, the speech is far too well suited to the

situation, and too like other speeches of Themistius, to permit any reasonable doubt of its being his own composition; and I find it hard to believe that Dr. Kesters can have read Or. XXIII (Σοφιστής) with any attention before propounding his thesis. That Themistius wrote XXVI as a sequel to XXIII is surely an irresistible inference from 313c. Both speeches are designed to rebut the charge of being a 'sophist,' and they are in fact complementary to one another.

Secondly, Dr. Kesters misinterprets what the *Phaedrus* has to say about the ideal Rhetoric. Plato does not, as he thinks, contend that Rhetoric must be superseded by Dialectic, but that it must be based on Dialectic and Psychology; it is false to say that 'Platon veut interdire au philosophe d'adresser la parole à la foule.' And that being so, the whole ground for believing that Themistius-Antisthenes is attacking the *Phaedrus* disappears. In fact, Plato would not have disputed Themistius' main contention, that Philosophy ought to address the multitude. What other motive could Plato have had for composing such dialogues as are obviously intended for the general educated public outside the Academy?

The most incredible parts of the book are those concerned with Themistius' alleged substitution of one proper name for another. The speech refers to Aristotle, Epicurus and Carneades; and since, on the author's presuppositions, the passages cannot be removed, other names must have stood in the original text. So Aristotle stands in one place for Protagoras, in another for Hippias, Epicurus for Periander, Carneades for (perhaps) Chiron. Now, with regard to the equation Aristotle = Protagoras, Themistius speaks in the passage in question (319d) of the distinction between works addressed to

the public and works intended for the school, and puts forward the theory that the latter were intentionally written in an obscure style. This idea finds expression in Plutarch and Aulus Gellius, and, what is more, Themistius himself, speaking of his own commentaries on Aristotle in Or. XXIII 294d, says that they ἐμφανίζεν ἐπιχειρεῖ τὸν νοῦν τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ ἐξάγειν ἐκ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐν οἷς ἐκεῖνος αὐτὸν καθεῖρξέ τε καὶ ἐφράξατο, τοῦ μὴ ἐπιδρομον εἶναι τοῖς παντάπασιν ἀμνήτοις. Further, immediately after the words in 319d to which I have referred, Themistius goes on to say that Ar. has provided ὄργανα for discriminating truth from falsehood, and ends this section on Ar. with the words πρῶτος Ἀριστοτέλης ὄργανον ἐμνησανίστατο. Plainly this is an allusion to Ar.'s logical works, which by the sixth century came to be actually entitled *Organon*; yet Dr. Kesters (who prudently refrains from quoting the word ὄργανον in his footnote to p. 52) finds that Antisthenes is referring to the μέτρον ἀνθρώπου doctrine of Protagoras.

On Epicurus = Periander I will waste no space: how it could be suggested by anyone who knew, as Dr. Kesters knows, what Themistius says in Or. XX 236a, I cannot conceive. At 330c Aristides is certainly not Aristides the Just, but Aelius Aristides.

A polemic against Plato can contain no praise of him: hence we are told that the section 318c-319a, which ends with a reference to Plato's characters as those ὑφ' ὧν κατεχόμεθα ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι καὶ αἰρόμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, is ironical.

The author of this book is clearly an erudite scholar, and it is most regrettable that he should have spent his energies on this strange paradox.

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College,  
Cambridge.

#### THE LOEB PAUSANIAS.

Pausanias: *Description of Greece*. With an English translation by W. H. S. JONES. In five volumes. IV: Books VIII(xxii)-X; pp. 605. V: Com-

panion Volume, prepared by R. E. WYCHERLEY; pp. xviii + 272; 85 plates. London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University

Press), 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) each.

THE Loeb Pausanias is now completed. The translation, originally planned for five volumes, has been compressed into four, leaving the index to accompany the illustrations in V., the Companion Volume, which marks a new departure in the series.

Dr. Jones's version, which is eminently concise and workmanlike, fully maintains the standard set by his previous volumes, and calls for no further remarks; but it cannot be overlooked that the proof-correction, especially in the Greek text, falls short of the degree of accuracy expected in a Loeb publication. *E.g.*, accents are omitted (pp. 40, l. 21; 124, l. 1; 190, l. 8) or are wrong (pp. 80, l. 15; 426, l. 18); hyphens have dropped out (pp. 57, l. 17; 414, l. 10), as has a breathing (p. 18, l. 5). On p. 22, l. 11, an *omikron* is missing from the last word; and on p. 118, l. 24, an *iota* subscript; on p. 602, l. 6, *γραφαί* must be read for *γραφα*. On p. 10, l. 18, a word-division is wrong, and on p. 5, l. 14, by a curious slip, Camira appears for Camirus. Two queries suggest themselves: is the translator right in interpreting *ὁ Πωμαῖος* collectively on p. 57, l. 13; could it not refer to Scipio himself? And in l. 2 of the oracle concerning the Gaulish invasion (p. 450) might we not venture to read *αὐλίσσεται* ('will encamp') in place of the rather pointless *αὐλήσει* ('will pipe'), which the translator (following Frazer) substitutes for MS. *αὐδήσει*? To conclude, we tender our warmest thanks to Dr. Jones, and congratulations on completing a noteworthy addition to the Loeb series.

In the Companion Volume, Mr. Wycherley gives us 28 maps and plans, 56 photographs (on 53 plates), 3 plates of coins, and finally drawings of Treu's arrangement of the Olympia pediments, together with Stuart Jones's reconstruc-

tion of the Chest of Cypselus; these are followed by a general index (85 pp.) and an index of artists. The plates are accompanied by a brief commentary which is admirably clear and concise, and soon convinces us that the editor is in every respect well qualified for his undertaking. As his Bibliography (p. xvii. f.) is severely restricted, it seems a pity that he has not utilized available space on some of the pages facing the illustrations to give his readers a little more guidance as to publications, for instance regarding Aegina, Mycenae, Nemea, and Damophon's group at Lycosura. On the other hand, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to improve upon the choice or the reproduction of the illustrations, whether drawings or photographs; and we particularly welcome recent and authoritative plans of the American excavations in the Athenian Agora and at Corinth. It is to be regretted that one or two plates (*e.g.* Nos. 41 and 77) are taken from rather spotty negatives, and that in the view of the Erechtheum from the west the Caryatid porch is partly obscured by scaffolding.

Misprints are commendably few, but Pausanias on the half-title is rather flagrant, and other necessary corrections are: p. xviii, read Y. Béquignon; p. 50, read Parodos; p. 58, l. 3, read E. N. Gardiner; in the index, p. 224, read Flamininus for Flaminius, and p. 270, Gitiadas for Gitiadus. Lastly, where all Greek names are rigorously Latinized, why is Tholos retained, in contrast to Dipylum and Pompeium? And what is the authority for the spelling Ilisus, or for using 'abut' (*passim*) as a transitive verb? It will be clearly understood from the trifling importance of these criticisms that this is really a most successful and desirable volume.

A. M. WOODWARD.

University of Sheffield.

#### SEXTUS EMPIRICUS IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

*Sextus Empiricus*, with an English translation by R. G. BURY. Vol. II. Pp. 489. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s.; leather, 12s. 6d.

THE first volume of the Loeb *Sextus Empiricus* was welcomed here with the reservation that more notes were needed to make it fully useful (*C.R.* xlviii, p. 198). The second, containing *adv. M.*

VII, VIII, brings disappointment. Not only are the notes of the scantiest, but neither text nor translation is satisfactory.

Nothing is to be said for a text which, without open confession of the fact, is more conservative than the translation which faces it. Dr Bury's version assumes an emendation already made by one scholar or another at VII. 99, 178, 180, 198 (cf. Aristotle *de gen. anim.* 779a 35), 301, VIII. 89, 92, 122, 187, and 313; but each time his text is unamended. At VII. 273, on the other hand, Heintz's emendation is printed, but Bekker's text translated. No fewer are the passages which have been shown to be indefensible but which are nevertheless translated as they stand.

The translation itself strikes me as more mechanical than that in the first volume; there are even places where it is best interpreted by recourse to the Greek. That Dr Bury is too easily satisfied is suggested by such translations as the following: VII. 27. The question whether a criterion of truth exists is much debated *διὰ τὸ τὰς γενι-*

*κωτάτας τῆς φιλοσοφίας αἰρέσεις περὶ τῶν κυριωτάτων βραβεύειν*, 'because the most extensive systems of philosophy pronounce judgement on the weightiest matters' (because it holds the decision between the most generic systems, viz., as the next sentence explains, the dogmatist and the sceptic). VII. 179. One of the signs of fever is *ἐλκώδης ἀφή*, 'ulcerous joints' (a broken eruption). VII. 244. Among typical optical illusions is *μύουρον εἶναι τὴν στοάν*, 'the porch is dilapidated.' VIII. 200. *θεμένων γὰρ νόμους, ὡς φασὶν, ὀρίσαι*, 'they are determined, as they say, by the law-givers.'

Finally, two suggestions to improve the text: VII. 100: *ποθὲν γὰρ ποί ἐστιν* (*πᾶρεστιν* MSS.) *ἡ γραμμὴ*, followed by Bekker's or a similar supplement, and read *ποί* for *ποῦ* twice at IV. 4-5. (Mutschmann and Dr Bury mutilate Bekker's supplement and insert it in the wrong place.) VII. 175: *καὶ <ταύτῃ καὶ> τῇ κοινῇ*.

F. H. SANDBACH.

*Trinity College, Cambridge.*

#### MORE OF THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT.

*A Greek-English Lexicon* compiled by H. G. LIDDELL and R. SCOTT. A New Edition. . . . Part 8: *περιφραγή—σιτισμός*. Pp. iv, 1393-1600. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934. Paper, 10s. 6d.

*πλεύμων*: in l. 3 a false *ó* has survived. *πῶα*: add A. *Fr.* 28, 29. *ποτιψαύω*: add S. *Tr.* 1214 (quoted under *προσψαύω*). *προτεραίος*: see C.R. XLIX 125 (and *προτεραίτερος* should not lurk under this lemma). *πῶς δοκεῖς*: add E. *Hec.* 1160. *ράκος*: in A. *Pr.* 1023 *σώματος ῥ.* surely not 'a strip of flesh'. *ῥόμβος*: in *ῥ.* and *ἰνγξ* see J.H.S. 1934, p. 1. *σίνις*: A. *Ag.* 718 should not be quoted as if *σίνιν* could stand. *σ'* for *σά*: τὰ σ' in *Trag.* also at E. *Trö.* 918 (?), *Hel.* 580; τὰμὰ καὶ σ' E. *El.* 273.

Quantities are not very well treated. The first syllable of *πόντια* is said to be 'short in A. *Th.* 152, Ch. 722, E. *Med.* 160, *Ion* 873, al., *Theoc.* l.c., but elsewhere long'. That 'al.' covers much, in-

cluding many instances of *δυν* in *Aristophanes*. The first syllable of *πότμος* is 'commonly short in *Trag.*, but long in S. *Tr.* 88, *Fr.* 871. 1': also in A. *Fr.* 159 and at least three passages of E. On the other hand, there is no note of quantity under *πίτνω* or *προπίτνω*, which have *ιτν* in S. *El.* 1380 and E. *H.F.* 1006; nor under *πετρ-*, *πυκν-*, *σαθρός*, and other words that contain a 'weak position'.

Apart from 'weak position', why (for example) is the *ι* of *πίτνς* noted but not the *υ*?

See also what is said here and there about elision. Of *πάροιθε* (in Part 7), 'sts. elided, as Il. 3. 162, E. *Hec.* 58'; 'προπάροιθ' *Od.* 24. 416, 447, A. *Ag.* 1020' (add E. *Ph.* 1510); but under *πρόσθεν*, whereas elision of *πρόσθα* is noted, there is nothing about elision of *πρόσθε*, though instances of *πρόσθ'* happen to be quoted from *Homer*. What is the reader to infer about *πρόσθ'* in *Tragedy*? Often, 'sts.', never? In

fact it occurs thirteen times in the whole plays.

Is it too much, or too late, to ask for a good long prefatory note on such matters? The diligent could then write references to it against the words concerned.

Addenda et corrigenda, hitherto multifarious, have now been run into a single list. Addenda addendis et corrigendis:—

ἐγὼ: ἐμέθεν not once only in E.; see Beck. ἔκτωρ: Ἐκτορέα or Ἐκτόρειᾶ in [E.] Rh. 762. ἰέρεια: say 'scanned -εῖᾱ in . . .', else ᾶ will be presumed; -ᾶ in E. Bac. 1114. κλέος 'only nom. and

acc. sg. and pl.': but Antiph. Fr. 163 has κλέους. οὐτίς: for 'only twice in E., Fr. 45, 325' read 'freq. in E.' (Alc. 194, 293, 330, 505; οὐ . . . τῶ' 432; adverbially, οὐτι 753, οὐ . . . τι 632; I have noted casually nine instances in other plays, from Med. to Ph. Similarly μήτις serves for μηδείς in I.A. 341, μή τι for μηδέν in Hec. 608.) παντελής, l. 1: σαγήν.

The printing and proof-reading deserve all praise. The headlines might have been more helpful; see especially pp. 1436-1445.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

### PHOTOGRAPHS OF ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS.

JOHANNES KIRCHNER: *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*. Ein Bilderatlas epigraphischer Denkmäler Attikas. Pp. 30; 54 plates phototype. Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1935. Buckram, RM. 42.

THE name of Dr. Johannes Kirchner has long been familiar to all students of Attic inscriptions, that is to say to all serious students of Athenian history. More than thirty years have passed since the publication of his invaluable *Prosopographia Attica*, but advancing age seems to increase rather than to impair his powers of unremitting and effective labour. He undertook the selection and treatment of the Attic texts included in the third edition of Dittenberger's classic *Sylloge* and, above all, he has been entrusted by the Berlin Academy with the Herculean task of preparing the *editio minor* of the second and third volumes of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, comprising all Attic inscriptions subsequent to 403 B.C., and has already carried the undertaking well on the road to its completion.

In the present volume he renders a further signal service to Greek epigraphical study, bringing to fruition an enterprise inaugurated in 1907. Its aim is to present the development of the Greek script in a series of photographs of Attic inscriptions, selected for their palaeographical clarity and interest rather than for their historical value and capable of being exactly, or at least

approximately, dated. No similar work has existed hitherto. Roehl's *Inscriptiones Graecae Antiquissimae* covered the Greek world outside Attica, confined itself to the archaic period, was comprehensive rather than selective and used line drawings or even typographical representations. His *Imagines Inscriptionum Graecarum Antiquissimarum* introduced very few photographic illustrations and, though selective and including Attic inscriptions, dealt with all Greek lands and excluded all save archaic texts. Kern's *Inscriptiones Graecae*, useful though it has proved, contains too small a number of examples to exhibit the tendencies and development of the script. Graindor's excellent *Album* came nearest to meeting the requirement, with its 112 Attic inscriptions accompanied by descriptive and textual notes: but many of its photographs were taken from squeezes and not from the actual stones, and in any case it represented only the Imperial period.

Kirchner gives us 54 plates containing 157 photographs of 150 inscriptions, ranging from the first half of the eighth century B.C. (he does not share Carpenter's view that the earliest extant Greek writings date from after 700) to the early years of the fifth century of our era. Most of these are cut in stone, but one engraved on bronze and nineteen scratched or painted on earthenware are included, among



them ten sherds used in Athenian *δοστροκοφίαι* between 486 and 417 B.C. The brief letterpress records the date, provenance, present location, nature and material of each inscribed object, the salient features of its script and a reference to its publication: where the dating rests upon the mention of an eponymous archon, the authority for the date adopted is indicated.

The work admirably fulfils its purpose. True, no two scholars would make the same selection of texts, but few, if any, possess a knowledge of the available material equal to that of the author. The text is characterized by that accuracy and conciseness which we associate with all his work. The few typographical slips I have noted will mislead no one. Four times, unfortunately, Wilhelm's article in the

*Wiener Anzeiger*, 1934, 89 ff., is cited as *S.B. Ak. Wien* (pp. 12, 13). The assumption is made—probable, but not certain—that the ostraka were written on the occasions on which those whose names they bear were actually ostracized; the 'Samian Decree' (No. 40) is dated 405-4 B.C., the year in which it was passed, though it was not engraved, as the name of Cephisophon shows, until 403-2; nor does Kirchner mention the view that *I.G. II*<sup>2</sup> 1951 (No. 45) relates to the battle of Arginusae in 406 B.C.

But these are trifles. The main fact is that at last, thanks to Dr. Kirchner's energy, we possess adequate materials for the palaeographical study of Attic inscriptions.

MARCUS N. TOD.

*Oriel College, Oxford.*

#### OSTRACA FROM THE FAYÛM.

LEIV AMUNDSEN: *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection. Part I: Texts.* (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. xxxiv.) Pp. xx+232; 2 figures in text and 8 collotype plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Cloth boards, \$3.50.

AN ostrakon from the Fayûm was once a *rara avis*; in Wilcken's great corpus only two (nos. 1303, 1306; the latter certainly Fayûmic, as O. Mich. 371, 407 show) are doubtfully given this provenance, while Tait's *Greek Ostraca* includes only one. And although in 1897 Grenfell and Hunt's excavations demonstrated the use of ostraca in the Fayûm in respectable quantities, the fifty select specimens in *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, with the score from Tebtunis, long remained unaugmented except by a few sporadic finds, notably those from Philadelphia (*B.G.U.* vii 1500-1562, 1697-1729)<sup>1</sup> and from Theadelphia (*S.B.* 1497-1517).<sup>2</sup> Dr. Amundsen at last gives us a reasonably large

quantity of material for study, viz. 699 ostraca, 97 collected by Dr. Askren of Medinet-el-Fayûm, the rest unearthed in the University of Michigan's excavations at Karanis. It is interesting to find Grenfell and Hunt's observation, that after extensive use in the early first century A.D. ostraca do not again become common till after about 250, confirmed by the Michigan collection, for besides a number of first-century examples the majority belong to 270-330 A.D. As the editor points out, this is not due to the chances of excavation, but means the partial supersession of papyri by ostraca, a phenomenon reflecting the growing impoverishment which ended in the abandonment of Karanis and many another once prosperous village of the Arsinoite nome.

Criticism of the texts must necessarily wait for the appearance of the commentary, though attention may be provisionally drawn to no. 96, a pen-drawing of the crocodile-god Sobk lying on a litter under a canopy before a laden altar. For the moment it is enough to say that the volume is beautifully printed and bountifully indexed. It might have been advantageous to indicate the cases where two or more ostraca are by the same hand, and some

<sup>1</sup> O. Mich. 1 looks rather like a stray from this group, the large sums in copper suggesting the reign of Philopator rather than Euergetes (Heichelheim, *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen* 21 ff.). The sign in l. 1 is perhaps *ὅπ* (*ὅπνημα*).

<sup>2</sup> O. Mich. 68 clearly comes from this find.

might have been more precisely dated (e.g. an ostrakon assigned to the 'early 4th cent.' and mentioning the 16th

Indiction must be of 328 A.D. or soon after).

T. C. SKEAT.

*British Museum.*

### EAST AND WEST.

VIKTOR EHRENBURG: *Ost und West. Studien zur geschichtlichen Problematik der Antike.* Pp. xii+236. (Schriften der philosophischen Fakultät der deutschen Universität in Prag, Band 15.) Brünn, Leipzig, etc.: Rohrer, 1935. Paper, RM. 7.

THIS volume of historical essays deserves careful reading. It is not always easy, for they are of different dates, and some—the chapter on Alexander, and the epilogue—were written for more popular readers, and none the less readable for that! The first, entitled *Universalgeschichte oder Altertumswissenschaft*, formulates the writer's position as historian and thinker, with incisive comments on predecessors and contemporaries. The second sketches the main points of contrast between oriental and western—essentially Hellenic—culture, and the principal phases of the long struggle between them. Full justice is done to the original contributions of Rome, hellenized through Etruria and Magna Graecia before the struggle with Carthage and the reluctant assumption of protectorate over the hellenized Mediterranean. The relations of Christianity to Judaism and to Hellenism and its consequent exceptional rôle in the empire are first stated here, and more fully examined in the final essay *Zeitwende*. An original handling of the Trojan War as a factor in Greek unity leads on to discussion of that aspect of Greek life which gives us our notion of 'sport', of doing whatever lies to hand in the best way, which is also the right way, without regard to accidentals; and consequently, in an anthropocentric world, of doing it best, or at all events better than the others, within the rules of the game. That a Greek did not always 'play fair' does not diminish the value of this competitive principle; that among many diverse communities there were different canons of 'excellence' was also to be expected, and led to tragic episodes.

Round the theme of the 'Generation NO. CCCLIX. VOL. XLIX.

of Marathon' Dr. Ehrenberg groups all that he has to say about the clash with Persia, the alternatives of 'freedom' and 'Medism', the personalities of the late sixth and early fifth centuries, and the climax of Greek 'freedom' in Athenian democracy. Only by implication does he touch what for some is the central episode of Greek history; for it is not in the clash of hegemonies that Greek civilization was either truest to itself or positively engaged in the long struggle with the East.

In the essay on Alexander, the personality of the hero, convinced of descent from Achilles and Heracles, and of obligations to that ancestry, rightly dominates all else; on this theme, the successive problems and Alexander's almost instinctive solutions take their place as episodes, almost as variations; in particular, the political collapse of what had been—and was still to be—the East, forced on him the hardest choice of all, to remain king of the Macedonians, or become theocratic dynast of an *oikoumene*. The clue to much in the Indian adventure Dr. Ehrenberg finds in the motif of the 'New Dionysus'. Bereft by successive accidents and tragedies of all his friends and initial helpers, Alexander had already no one to link him in a human way with common humanity.

The task of Sertorius in the far west does not at first sight challenge comparison with that of Alexander. But the greatness of his achievement, and of his character, emerges from a fresh examination of the old charge that he 'betrayed Rome'. Here the facts are marshalled fairly and clearly, and in particular the details of Plutarch's biography are brought into a larger and in some respects original and convincing perspective. Sertorius' bargain with Mithradates, for example, was the only practicable way of saving—not surrendering—Rome's essential *pieu d terre* in the Near East.

A final chapter carries the argument

on to the establishment of Christianity as a fresh reconciliation of what remained vital in East and ancient West

alike: and completes the programme of a remarkable and helpful book.

J. L. MYRES.

*New College, Oxford.*

#### ARTEMIS EPHESIA.

HERMANN THIERSCH: *Artemis Ephesia*. Eine archäologische Untersuchung. Teil I, Katalog der erhaltenen Denkmäler. (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. III<sup>te</sup> Folge. Nr. 12.) Pp. iv + 150; 76 plates, 3 figs. in text. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Paper, RM. 22.

THIS is part of a comprehensive study of the well-known type of the Ephesian Artemis, and contains a careful description of the known extant monuments of all kinds with representations of the goddess. They range from free statues in stone, marble, or bronze to terracottas, lamps, mosaics, reliefs, gems, and coins. Part II, also by Professor Thiersch, will provide the commentary and the discussion of the material here set out so fully and accurately. It will be awaited with much interest. His explanation of the origin of the type and his reasons for its apparent late introduction are certain to be valuable, for it seems that its first occurrence is on cistophori of the second century B.C. His treatment of the monuments is, as might be expected from so sound a scholar, practically all that could be desired. There might be complaints of some lack of system and uniformity in the catalogue-like notices of the various monuments, but this can hardly be

otherwise when the material has had to be collected from so many sources and over some considerable period of time. Further, a slight variation in form prevents monotony. The author's careful method is well illustrated by his demonstration that the Soane and Kircher examples are probably identical and by his attempt to trace the original of Plate LXXVI and his conclusion that it was a work of the sixteenth century. His patient observation is also admirably displayed in his analysis of the sculptures and in his care in deciding about the extent of the restorations which, as he rightly says, are in some cases almost impossible to distinguish. He completes his excellent collection of the ancient monuments with a similar catalogue of modern versions, whether definitely intended to deceive or not, and of representations of the type by artists from Raphael down to a designer of postage-stamps. The plates, which illustrate practically everything, are beautifully clear, and nothing seems to have been left undone to make this work thorough and indispensable. Misprints are few: on p. 12 Sothby lacks an e; on p. 128 unschnldig; on p. 129 Abschnitt C should be Abschnitt B; and on p. 68 the Antioch mentioned is not A. ad Orontem, but A. Pisidiae.

A. J. B. WACE.

*Cambridge.*

#### THE MYSTIC GOSPEL OF HELLENISTIC JUDAISM.

E. R. GOODENOUGH: *By Light, Light*. The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. Pp. xv + 436. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford). Cloth, \$5 or 22s. 6d.

THIS is an important and in many ways a very illuminating book. Its main thesis is stated in the author's own words (p. 5) slightly rearranged. 'Judaism in the Greek Diaspora became for at least an important minority such a

mystery, as the Greeks made of the folk religions of Isis and Attis and later of Mithra and Christianity on the model and with the philosophic foundation of Orpheus.' Elsewhere (p. 263) he speaks of its Judaism as 'for all its passionate Jewish loyalty so thoroughly paganized that its postulates and objectives were those of Hellenistic mysteries rather than those of any Judaism we have hitherto known.'

Philo's 'mysticism' is obvious, if the word is used in the sense in which Streeter (*Four Gospels*, p. 366) applies it to 'the religious side of the philosophic tradition dominant in Hellenic thought and seen at its height in Plato and Plotinus.' On the details of Philonic mysticism, the Existent or Absolute Being, the Logos and its counterpart Sophia, the cosmic signification of the Tabernacle as well as the symbolical meaning attached to the Patriarchs and Aaron and Moses, Professor Goodenough has much to say supported by a vast wealth of quotations and references, for he knows Philo from end to end. Though much has been said on these subjects by previous writers, it will be found, I think, that this book adds much, and it certainly puts it in a new light. Less familiar is its equation of many of the leading features of Philo's system to Orphism and Isiac and Iranian mysteries. The evidence for this is striking and seems to me convincing, particularly when coupled with the author's proviso that Philo himself is unconscious of a connection created before his time by the contact of the Dispersion with the Greek.

But can we pass on from 'mysticism' to 'mystery'? Professor Goodenough seems to use the words indiscriminately. But to me, perhaps wrongly, 'mystery'

connotes a definite 'thiasos' or congregation, a ceremonial initiation, and a hope of salvation or illumination to be obtained with the aid of a special ritual. Is there any hint of this in Philo? No doubt he uses all the terms constantly, just as he uses metaphors from the Games. Our author is inclined, though tentatively, to go further (pp. 218, 259) and postulate a definite organization of initiates. I do not find his evidence at all convincing, but, except as to the appropriateness of the word 'mystery,' it does not affect his main argument.

There are two main points on which I am at present unconverted. One is his belief that Philo's main purpose is to set forth the 'Mystery.' It still seems to me that Philo's primary object was to interpret—to show that every scene and incident of the Pentateuch had its spiritual meaning, often, but not necessarily, bearing on the mystery. The other is the profound contrast which he finds between the mystic and the 'normative' Judaism. Apart from Pharisaic legalism is it really so great? Is not 'paganized' too strong a word? However they may differ in development of detail, is there any difference of spirit between Philonic piety and that of the 139th Psalm?

F. H. COLSON.

*St. John's College, Cambridge.*

#### SALLUST.

KURT LATTE: *Sallust*. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe: Interpretationen. Heft 4.) Pp. 59. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 3.20.

THIS comprehensive study of the mind and style of Sallust is most opportune. In syntax and style the various elements of the narrative have received individual treatment full enough to justify an attempt at synthesis; in historical criticism there has been a preoccupation with Sallust's political tendencies which requires some redressing by an indication of the stylistic considerations in his choice of material. In the first case Professor Latte offers a convincing picture of the style as the man; in the second he indicates the stylistic limits

within which political tendencies could have play in the composition of the monographs, and so provides the basis for further and more balanced research into the literary-historical factors determining their composition.

The study is arranged so as to build up a conception of Sallust's temperament from the evidence of literary expression and to explain it by the circumstances of his life and times. Not only sentence-structure but narrative style and formal composition are shown to be characterized by an extreme tendency to antithesis which should be taken to represent a fundamentally antithetical mode of thought. The effect is one of irregularity and restlessness. The mood reflected in this style

is seen openly in the insistence on the evil of man and the impression of hopeless action and reaction in the historical process. Then, in a brilliant chapter showing the relation of contemporary thought to the tone of self-justification in the prooemia, this pessimism is explained as the result of Sallust's bitter disappointment in his political ambitions at a time when the State was still held to afford the only proper scope for a man's activity.

The section on syntax and style presents a clear summary well illustrated by examples and with full bibliographical references. The section on composition has a particularly important contribution in a discussion and analysis of the structure of the Catiline and the Jugurtha, and in the approach to the

monographs as a simplified, stylized form excluding detail and concentrating attention on the leading historical figures. The evidence is presented throughout in a tangible way by quotation and interpretation of the narrative; a most enlightening feature is the comparison of the handling of similar passages in other writers.

This work should prove of valuable service to the study of Sallust. It should provide a stimulus and setting for the renewed study of style, and in the more urgent problem of composition should direct investigation along the fruitful lines of combined literary and historical research.

A. H. McDONALD.

University College, Nottingham.

#### A COMMENTARY ON AENEID I.

P. Vergili Maronis *Aeneidos* Liber Primus. Edited with notes by R. S. CONWAY. Pp. xiv+149. Cambridge: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE great task of revising (or replacing) the Conington-Nettleship edition of Virgil, which Professor Conway had undertaken, was cut short by his untimely death. But he left behind him a full commentary on the First Book of the *Aeneid*, which has been prepared for press with admirable care by his son Mr G. S. Conway. The work is in a sense a fragment; for it lacks the general Introduction to the *Aeneid* and the textual criticism which formed part of its design; and (like the *Aeneid* itself) it lacks the final revision of the author. But even as it stands, it is a worthy memorial of a fine scholar, a striking personality, and a great Virgil-lover. It is much more than a mere revision; it is an entirely new commentary and one that in many respects is singularly unlike any of its predecessors. For, if it contains little that is startlingly new, it has a freshness and individuality of its own. It is true that it is voluminous; for it runs to some 70,000 words of comment on 756 lines—a scale that might have proved embarrassing if extended to the whole

poem. It is true also that it contains a considerable number of notes more suited to a school text-book than to a work of this character, and that the first impression is one of diffuseness or even of irrelevance. But that feeling soon vanishes; for the whole work is full of life and gives a curious impression of having been written for delivery to an audience—you can almost hear him delivering it. His judgments, too, are as a rule marked by good sense and discrimination, and he rarely sends the reader empty away.

One of the most striking features is that far more space than usual is allotted to the minute discussion of Virgilian idioms of thought and language and to the detailed consideration of questions of grammar and syntax. The notes on the latter are interesting and unusually well presented (e.g. such notes as those on *Argi* and *Argivi* (24), *adueneris* (388), *adolere* (704)). The discussion on the 'half-active' use of the participle in *-tus* (246 and 320) is admirable, but would have been improved by a reference to instances where the participle followed by the accusative is a genuine passive. Again, the derivation of *ambrosia* from the Arabic *ambar* (8, 403) and the suggested connexion of *numen* with *πνεῦμα* (8) are



put forward too confidently and need defensive argument.

The metrical notes are excellent (e.g. the interesting defence of the short *u* in *conubio* (73)), though some readers may regret the revival of the view that the hypermetric *nixaeque* (448) is designed to suggest 'the projection of the architrave.' The general exegesis is clear and interesting: (e.g.) the notes on Aeolus and his cave (52); *fata* in the sense of 'oracles'; the able defence of *Iulius* (286-90) = C. Iulius Caesar; *sum pius Aeneas* (378); *captas* in the simile of the swans (395); *di tibi, siqua pios* etc. (603-5); *laetitiamque dei*—rejecting *dii, die*—(636); *mediamque locavit* (698). Attention must be called to the very full and ingenious note on 726: Nettleship's view that *laquearibus* means 'chains' is defended; the evidence is however inconclusive; the testimony of glossaries can count for little against the admitted fact that wherever *laquear* is used in literature it refers to a panelled ceiling; Statius (*Theb.* I. 120) proves no more than that *lychni* might be hung on gilded chains, and it is hard to see why it should be regarded as convincing. There are some notes that seem inadequate or even perverse. The intrusion of what many regard as the *ingens* heresy (114), while perhaps inevitable, is a cause for regret. In 497 why is *stipante* less formal than *comitante*? *stipo* is regularly used of a royal escort (cp. *stipatores* = 'body-guard'). In the otherwise excellent note on 505 an explanation of the technical term *testudo*

is required in view of the misstatement in the dictionaries that it means a 'vault.' The note on *Saturnia* (569) contains a somewhat startling statement. Can it be regarded as generally accepted that the expulsion of Saturn by Jove 'represents in history the conquest of a southern population by invaders from the north'? In 608 *polus dum sidera pascet* is interpreted "sustains," like a flock of sheep in the celestial pasture . . . , perhaps not without reference to guesses like that of Lucretius of some relation in substance between the stars and the sky.' Surely we have a clear reference to the divine fire of the Stoics that feeds all things. On 755 it is urged that there is no contradiction between this passage and V. 626, where the statement about *septima aetas* is repeated, and that the design of Virgil is to emphasize how short a time Aeneas had been at Carthage (July, August, September). It would have been fairer to rebut the reasons to the contrary (i.e., the references to winter in Book IV), which *prima facie* are not lightly to be rejected.

But these are matters of minor importance and do not affect the general excellence of a very interesting and stimulating work. The book is admirably produced and well equipped with Indices, which, however, like most of their kind, are not without their imperfections and might be overhauled and slightly enlarged with a view to a second edition. H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

## RELIGION IN VIRGIL.

CYRIL BAILEY: *Religion in Virgil*. Pp. 338. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 15s.

THIS is a book which Warde Fowler would have enjoyed. Much has been written about the evidence contained in the Virgilian poems for the religious customs and beliefs of the poet's contemporary fellow-countrymen, and perhaps even more about the personal attitude to religious matters of one of the greatest minds of antiquity. But no one, I think, has before made the systematic survey which is really indis-

pensable to the proper handling of either topic. Mr. Bailey's book, therefore, fills a real gap. That it is written with thoroughness by a Virgilian who is also a master of the history of Roman religion, goes without saying.

What he sets out to do is to examine the Virgilian references to cults, deities, and religious and eschatological concepts, and to attempt to analyse in each case what is of Italian origin, what is borrowed from Greek religion and mythology, what belongs to philosophical speculation, and what to the poet him-

self. Virgil's real affection for the old Italian element, an affection which is clearly something warmer than mere antiquarian or propagandist interest, is well brought out. It is an interesting point too that in some cases where a Greek deity had become equated with an Italian, Virgil appears to discriminate to the point of never assigning to the Roman name the non-Italian attributes attaching to the Greek. Minerva, for example, seems always to be the old Italian goddess of handicraft.

Specially valuable, perhaps, is the discussion of Virgil's use of *fatum* and his conception of destiny. In the poet's own mind we seem here to perceive the philosophical inconsistency which is perhaps the normal working creed of lesser men, a refusal in the last resort to surrender individual freedom of the will to an admitted determinism of an ordered universe. There are similar inconsistencies, naturally enough, in Virgilian eschatology, which in its higher aspect represents a personal conflation of philosophical answers to the riddle of existence. Students of Roman religion will be grateful for the collection of passages referring to funerary rites. There is an admirable discussion of the altars, and the conclusion is one with which I should agree, that the erection of altars to the dead is Hellenistic and not Roman practice.

It is a book to read and to return to, and withal a most compendious book of reference. The evidence is fully set out, the commentary lucid, the judgment sober, and the analysis subtle. Just here and there one may suspect over-

subtlety. Perhaps not quite enough allowance has been made for purely literary origins in echoes of Homer. For example, *Aeneid* ii 791 and *Georgic* iv 499, dealing with the insubstantial and dreamlike condition of the visible dead, are direct echoes of λ 206 and Ψ 99. In the discussion of the oath in *Aeneid* xii 176 we are told that several strata of religious ideas are involved: Sol and Terra represent the cosmological worship of the philosophic thought of the day, and so on. But we recall Γ 276

Ζεῦ πάτερ, Ἴδηθεν μέδων, κούδιστε, μέγιστε,  
ἥελός θ' ὅς πᾶντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πᾶντ' ἐπακούεις,  
καὶ Ποταμοὶ καὶ Γαῖα, κτλ.

In fact a cento constructed from this passage together with K 329, O 36, and T 258 would provide practically all the elements in the alleged strata with the natural exception of Mars. I should prefer Servius' explanation of the very difficult *una superstitio superis quae red-dita divis* to Mr. Bailey's alternative second thought that Virgil may have meant that gods by their very nature had no need of *religio*. *Superstitio*, according to Servius, is here a synonym of *religio*, and in later Latin it does appear sometimes to be used in this sense, e.g. in Seneca, *Ep.* XCV 35: 'prima fundamenta iacienda sunt et insinuanda virtus. Huius quadam superstitione teneantur: hanc ament.' The translation *triennial orgies for trieterica orgia* offends the pedant, for the meaning is 'rites which take place in every alternate year,' not 'every three years.'

W. R. HALLIDAY.

King's College, London.

#### THE MANUSCRIPTS OF PROPERTIUS.

ALICE CATHERINE FERGUSON: *The Manuscripts of Propertius*. Pp. 68. Private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Illinois, 1934. Paper.

DR. FERGUSON is a pupil of Professor Ullman, and has been allowed to use his notes and photographs. She has handled her stuff well, and the result is an interesting and valuable dissertation. Chaps. I-III are concerned with the search for MSS other than FL which

may be used to recover the tradition of A where that MS itself fails us. The author discusses five MSS which she believes to be descended from A independently of F: the 'Antiquum Manuscriptum', variants from which are to be found in Barb. lat. 34 and which she calls E; Paris 8458 (p); Paris 7989 (P); Neap. IV. F. 19; and an incomplete MS at Palermo; and four which she thinks are descended from A through F, Vat. lat. 1611: Harley 2550; Magl.

II. IX. 125; and Laur. 33. 14. She deals with E and p in detail, only briefly with the rest. This is regrettable in the case of P, whose agreements with A against F are more striking than those of E and p. She cites four such examples from P. Out of several more I will quote three, i. 5 Title Ad Gallam AP: Ad Gallum F; i. 13. 31 blandior—heroinis AP: blandior erohinis F; i. 14. 6 Vgetur A: Vøgetur P: Vrgetur F. In the second example the meaningless line is very curious. In A it is written in red ink. This evidence seems to show that P is derived from A independently not only of F but also of Petrarch's MS. If this be so, Ullman's theory of the relations of the MSS, which Ferguson has adopted, needs modification.

Chap. IV aims at distinguishing F's correctors, viz. the original scribe (F<sup>1</sup>), Lombardo (F<sup>2</sup>), Coluccio (F<sup>3</sup>), and later correctors (F<sup>r</sup>). It proves Dr. Ferguson's courage and, I hope, her skill that she has left a very small proportion of the corrections unassigned. The marginalia are the easiest to identify, since besides the script we have the evidence of the prefatory word, if any, and also normally that of the reference mark. The prefix  $\dot{\epsilon}$  is characteristic of Coluccio, cp. i. 17. 19; ii. 22. 6; ii. 29. 40; and probably ii. 22. 16.  $\dot{A}$  and  $\dot{P}$  usually indicate a correction by Lombardo, but not always. In doubtful cases introduced by these prefixes, as also where there is no prefix, the reference marks become important. Of these Lombardo employs a clearly distinguishable selection, his favourite being / (about 50 examples). I should therefore give him ii. 27. 7  $\dot{P}$  capiti, which has this mark, but which Ferguson assigns to Coluccio. Another mark used by Lombardo is  $\overline{\text{—}}$ , cp. iii. 13. 59; iv. 5. 39; iv. 11. 7; iv. 11. 85. I therefore doubt Ferguson's assignment

(given below in brackets) of the five other marginalia accompanied by this mark, i. 8. 29 cupidus (F<sup>1</sup>); i. 15. 35 al' iurabas (F<sup>1</sup>); i. 22. 10 al' fertilis (F<sup>3</sup>); ii. 18. 27 d (sic, not  $\dot{\epsilon}$ ) multa (F<sup>3</sup>); iii. 13. 51 limina (F<sup>3</sup>). On similar grounds I should credit F<sup>2</sup>, not F<sup>3</sup>, with iii. 11. 61 al' curcius, since it is marked —u, a sign used by Lombardo in nine admitted examples. On the other hand I should now assign to Coluccio ii. 24. 46 d (sic, not  $\dot{\epsilon}$ ) fallaci, since it is marked .., a sign used by him elsewhere. I also now incline to accept Ferguson's attribution to F<sup>3</sup> of i. 5. 3 feros. meos: ii. 6. 8 Oscula ne desint etc. The authorship of these two corrections is of some importance for the history of the text.

Among the interlinear corrections the most difficult case accompanied by a prefatory sign is ii. 6. 24 al' uiri. Ferguson assigns it to Coluccio. It is a certain, but not very obvious, emendation of *feri*. Coluccio's emendations are generally much less meritorious, but the fact that *uiri* is otherwise found only in P and the *deteriores* favours Ferguson, since if Lombardo had taken it from Petrarch's MS we should expect it to be more common. Of interlinear corrections lacking a prefatory sign I will mention only i. 1. 13 ab. This Ferguson assigns to F<sup>r</sup>. If this be right, the corrector has copied the archaic script.

I have noted but cannot specify here some fifty omissions or mistakes in Ferguson's collation of F, mostly unimportant. On p. 39 *monitu versutissime bene* is a curious misreading of *monitus uersutissim(a)e len(a)e*. The dissertation ends with a useful list of Propertius MSS. They number 127, and the author has examined readings from over 70.

E. A. BARBER.

Exeter College, Oxford.

#### TOWN AND STATE IN ROMAN ITALY.

HANS RUDOLPH: *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien*. Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung des Munizipalwesens in der republikanischen Zeit. Pp. viii + 257. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 10 (bound, 12).

THE transition of Rome from the city-state to the nation was based primarily on her relations to the Italian towns: for this, if for no other reason, the position of the *municipia* during the Republic is an important question. Yet apart from the work of Mommsen and Beloch

there has been little attempt to study the problem comprehensively, and controversies over individual trees have tended to obscure the wood. This book then is extremely welcome. The author marshals the literary texts and inscriptions, and covers the ground thoroughly: his interpretation of familiar evidence is refreshingly independent: he builds up a thesis consistent and compact; and his conclusions are revolutionary without being wild.

As against Rosenberg and Kornemann he believes that there are no traces of non-Roman institutions in municipal magistracies, and that from the first Rome imposed new constitutions on towns admitted to the citizenship. The *municipia* of the first group, formed in 338 B.C., were administered by two aediles, while the dictatorship was introduced by Rome for sacral purposes—in particular, representation at the Latin festival (Milo's duties as dictator of Lanuvium in 52 B.C. were religious and not political). The Sabine *octoviri* were boards of eight established by Rome, acting as a body and not as individuals. The three-aedile constitution of Formiae, Fundi and Arpinum was a Roman adaptation of the Roman method of governing rural *pagi*. All these magistrates had limited powers of administration, but jurisdiction was entirely in the hands of the Roman praetor and his *praefecti*. Nor was the position of citizen-colonies different. They were governed from the first by *duoviri* and equally subject to the *praefectus*. The settlement of the Social War brought no radical change, except in the form of the municipal magistracy, which now became a board of four, *quattuorviri*, similar in form and function to the Sabine *octoviri*. Though no new prefectures were formed, local magistrates still lacked jurisdiction. The transition to the situation which we find in the Empire was not a process of gradual evolution, but the revolutionary creation of an individual, Caesar. The first sign is the Caesarian Lex Mamilia of 55 B.C., which provides for the municipalization of the whole of Italy and the elimination of *fora* and *conciliabula*. In 48 or 47 B.C. comes the drastic change. By a Lex Iulia Municipalis powers of

jurisdiction are given to the leading magistrates in the towns, and so for the first time Rome passes beyond the city-state. *Duovirs* are now the normal magistrates in *municipia* as well as colonies, but no changes are demanded in existing titles. The outward effect of the law in the *quattuorvirate* is that now for the first time comes a differentiation in function within the board (*quattuorviri iure dicundo* and *quattuorviri aedilicia potestate*), to which the well-known inscription from Patavium refers (*IIIIvir aediliciae potest(atis) e lege Iulia municipali*). The Heraclea tablet shows the conclusion of the reform and minor additions to it; and the puzzling *municipia fundana* are the new *municipia* formed by the Lex Mamilia in country districts from individual estates (*fundi*). The changes created by Caesar's law were carried out not by commissioners, but by the towns themselves (cf. Cic. *ad fam.* 13, 11, 3). Tarentum is a special case, and the main purpose of the Lex Tarentina (c. 47 B.C.) was to unite the *municipium* of Tarentum and the Gracchan colony of Neptunia.

This attractive thesis offers a simple solution to many of the problems that have puzzled earlier writers, but it is difficult to accept it as it stands. Although the author has strongly defended his view of the municipal dictatorship, he has left many difficulties unexplained. If there was a *rex sacrorum* at Lanuvium, what need was there for another religious official? If the dictator was needed for the Latin festival, what need had Caere for one? Why again should a purely religious officer become the chief executive of the town after Caesar's reform, when there were already two aediles with administrative duties, and any departure from the collegiate principle was an anomaly? And surely the present restoration in the Lex Acilia, 78, of (*dicta*)tor at the head of the list of Latin magistrates is right (*censor* will not fit, and *quaestor* would have followed, not preceded, *praetor*). Nor is the case for making *duoviri* the original magistrates in colonies a strong one. It is dangerous to argue from Puteoli alone, and it is much easier to believe that praetors were changed to *duoviri* than the reverse.



But the most important issue is the question of jurisdiction. It is vital for the thesis that the qualifications *iure dicundo* and *aedilicia potestate* should not appear before 49 B.C., and the test comes in the first volume of the Corpus, which closes with Caesar's death. 'Hier fehlen die späteren Appositionen fast allgemein.' But there are more than a dozen instances, and they need explanation. Most Pompeian scholars have dated C.I.L. I<sup>2</sup>. 1635 to the Sullan period, and 2098 has usually been placed earlier than Caesar. At Beneventum the number of inscriptions that would have to be dated between 48 and 42 B.C. is suspiciously large. Again,

the Lex Mamilia (55) speaks of 'quicumque magistratus . . . iure dicundo praeerit,' and clearly implies that magistrates with powers of jurisdiction are a normal feature of the constitutions imposed by that law at that time.

However, such issues cannot be settled within the space of a short review. It remains to recommend the book warmly. Its keenest critics will find it stimulating, and, even if some of the conclusions have to be abandoned, it will remain a valuable contribution to our understanding of problems of first-rate importance.

R. MEIGGS.

*Keble College, Oxford.*

#### SWEDISH RESEARCHES IN ITALY.

*Opuscula Archaeologica*. Vol. i, fasc. 1. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. iv, 1.) Pp. 86; 8 plates and 6 illustrations in text. Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1934. Paper, 10s. 6d.

THE Swedish Institute in Rome has begun to publish the researches of its members. The present instalment contains three papers.

The first, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der Helena- und Constantiasarkophage*, by E. Sjöqvist and A. Westholm, is a careful study of two famous treasures of the Vatican. The authors observe Egyptian influence upon the style of both, and assign them to different periods. The sarcophagus of Helena was restored by Pius VI. After a minute examination of its decorations, and of views of it as seen by Bosio and Piranesi, the authors conclude that the restorations were so extensive that one figure only is to be regarded as original; and, with the help of a fragmentary head preserved in the Vatican which they regard as part of the original decorations, they assign the sarcophagus to the Antonine Age. They have made out a good case for their dating. On the other hand, they accept the usual view that the sarcophagus of Constantia belongs to the fourth century. An ancillary topic is dealt with in a concluding section. A well-preserved head in porphyry, now in Stockholm, is regarded, from the evidence of

busts in the Louvre and in Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo, as a portrait of L. Verus, and is assigned to the same period as the sarcophagus of Helena.

In his paper *Sur la question de la ville de Laurente* G. Bendz deals attractively with a problem of Latian topography which has fascinated many scholars. Was there such a place as Laurentum, and, if so, where may its remains be sought? The author assails the theory that Laurentum never existed and that Lavinium (now Pratica di Mare) was the city of the Laurentes. He concludes that Laurentum actually existed until, c. 50-150 A.D., the inhabitants were transferred to Lavinium, and joins Nibby in suggesting Capocotta as a site where the remains of Laurentum may be revealed by the spade. In a problem in which nothing can be proved, the issue being between possibilities, Bendz argues shrewdly and persuasively.

*Ancient Latin Cities of the Hills and Plains: a study in the evolution of types of settlement in Ancient Italy*, is an interesting and stimulating suggestion by Gösta Säfllund that whereas before the Hannibalic War inhabited sites in Italy were to be found mainly in elevated situations with natural defences, the second century B.C. saw the beginning of a process by which towns and colonies were removed to sites on lower ground. Since in a short review it is not possible to appreciate fully the



author's discussion of the sites chosen for consideration, Fregellae and Carsioli (Latin colonies), Aquinum, Privernum, Casinum and Saepinum (Italic towns), I may say that in the main his proposition is convincing and is an important contribution to Italian topography and history.

May I be permitted to add a fact, unmentioned by Säf Lund, and not irrelevant to his discussion of Fregellae? Fragments of an *arx* in polygonal masonry which exist (or were existing

in May, 1914) near the summit of the hill above Rocca d'Arce seem to belong to that of the original Fregellae and to support Säf Lund's theory that at the outset the site was not at Opri, but at Arce.

This volume is sure of a warm welcome, and most students will be grateful to the authors for writing in German, French and English.

R. GARDNER.

*Emmanuel College, Cambridge.*

### COINS FROM ROMAN COLOGNE.

WILHELM REUSCH: *Der Kölner Münzschatzfund vom Jahre 1909. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des römischen Köln.* Pp. 32; 6 plates. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 4.

HOARDS of coins have their destinies, both in ancient and modern times,—destinies often obscure and tragic. Fear of foreign enemy or domestic oppressor led some anxious capitalist to conceal his wealth; death by violence overtook him and the hoard was never recovered. A hoard is accidentally brought to light. Finders and dealers too often conspire to suppress all details and disperse it in the dark. Tantalizing rumours leak out into the world of scholars, too late for accurate research.

Dr. Reusch has here undertaken with much success the difficult task of reconstructing the great Cologne hoard of 1909. He has identified beyond serious doubt the four pots in which it was stored, estimated from their size the approximate bulk of the hoard, and recovered, with some degree of certainty, a large proportion of the original gold, a much smaller but still representative proportion of the original silver content. The hoard apparently consisted of about one hundred aurei and over twenty-two thousand silver coins, mainly denarii, but with a sprinkling of Antoniniani.

The range is from Nero to Maximinus Thrax, with most reigns fairly well represented, but with a marked increase in numbers from Septimius Severus onwards. The gold apparently only goes down to Geta.

So much for the hoard in its original form and its present reconstruction. Of its ancient history also Dr. Reusch has something of interest to tell us. Cologne in the reign of that rough soldier, Maximin, was in no danger from the barbarian. The victorious Roman arms were being carried deep into the heart of Germany. The danger lay nearer home. The Emperor, to satisfy his greedy soldiery, was trying to lay his hands on all the treasures of his subjects. The present hoard certainly represents an attempt to defeat Maximin's extortioner.

There are some scraps of evidence that suggest that the treasure belonged to a temple. The temple treasurer hid away his hoard, but lost his life.

Dr. Reusch has made a valuable contribution to numismatic history, which incidentally casts a ray of light on the history of Roman Cologne in the days when the shadows began to darken over the West.

H. MATTINGLY.

*British Museum.*

## THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHEMISTRY.

Professor J. R. PARTINGTON, M.B.E., D.Sc.: *Origins and Development of Applied Chemistry*. Pp. xii + 597. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, 1935. Cloth, 45s.

THE much-abused adjective 'monumental' may be fittingly applied to Dr. Partington's massive book. Item by item, reference by reference, he has built up a solid and enduring structure, which is quite indispensable to the serious student of the history of chemistry.

The author tells us in his preface that his intention is to give a reasonably concise and systematic account of the sources, production, and uses of materials in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, the Ægean, Troy, and Cyprus, Asia Minor, Persia, Phœnicia, and Palestine, from the earliest times to the end of the Bronze Age.

It may seem to readers of the *Classical Review* that this limitation of time stops the work at the point where it becomes interesting to them. They will find, however, that the writer claims 'that the knowledge of the use of materials in the Classical Period, which usually forms the starting-point for the historian of science, is almost wholly derived from much older cultures.' To many classical scholars indeed the greatest interest of the book lies in a consideration whether the author has proved this rather startling thesis.

In the reviewer's opinion he has done so. It is very probable that the Roman technicians used some methods which they themselves had developed, but the chief materials at their disposal were known to earlier civilizations, and there seems to be little evidence that the

workshop devices of the Classical Period produced many results previously unattainable.

The book is divided into sections by civilizations. In each case there is a very useful account of the general history and archæology of the region concerned, followed by a detailed description of the materials employed. The author has cast his net widely in seeking information, and has included the results of all the important expeditions, and mentioned a host of objects surviving from antiquity and now scattered through the museums of the world.

It is scarcely fitting to criticize such a thorough and useful book, but the reviewer would have read it with even greater pleasure if the author, in discussing each important material, had added a brief account of the chemical means used, or likely to have been used, for extracting it from its natural sources. It is true that the expert chemist can often guess at these processes and that the classicist may not be interested in them. It is true also that exact information about ancient technique is frequently lacking, and Dr. Partington has preferred, perhaps properly, to confine himself to ascertained facts. There will nevertheless be many readers who would have been grateful for more discussion, and even conjecture, about the chemical methods employed.

The book is produced in a manner worthy of such a work, and the vast army of references is marshalled so as not to interfere unduly with the reader's comfort. The indexes, particularly essential in this case, occupy 65 pages.

K. C. BAILEY.

Trinity College, Dublin.

## AN INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

*A Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar (Indo-European)*.

By T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS. Pp. xii + 78. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS book is founded mainly on Greek and Latin, which are compared with one another and with Germanic (mainly

Gothic and English), Celtic (mostly Welsh), and Sanskrit. The prominence given to Welsh will no doubt make it useful to Welsh-speaking students, and need not interfere with its usefulness to others. In so far as it makes positive statements, it is in the main trustworthy; its faults are mainly faults of omission, and especially of the omission

to make sufficient use of Sanskrit. For instance, the form *tekhōn* is mentioned as the ancestor of *τέκτων* (p. 24) without the Sanskrit word; the I.-E. loc. plur. ending is given as *-su* (pp. 55, 59), but no evidence is offered; the *-i-* and *-u-* stems are omitted as being too complicated for an elementary book, but the reconstructed forms *currou-s*, *manou-s*, *classejes* (pp. 48, 53, 54) are nevertheless cited, and for lack of the Sanskrit and other evidence may well arouse incredulity. On pp. 27 and 39 *καρδία* is compared with Skt. *hṛdayah*; but only *hṛdayam* exists, and its relation to *καρδία* is not very close. A less important error is Skt. *dhṛṣṇoti* (which should have 'cerebral' *ṇ*) on p. 39.

The accounts given of Verner's Law and of the accentuation of the Greek verb, while not actually misleading, suffer from the omission to mention anywhere in the book how the Sanskrit accent is known, and as all Sanskrit forms throughout the book are given without their accents, the reader may suppose that very little is known about it; the mere statement that Sanskrit had a pitch accent (p. 40) will not carry him far. The space necessary for a fuller use of Sanskrit could have been found by the omission of some less important matter. In spite of these defects the book may prove useful both in Wales and elsewhere.

R. MCKENZIE.

Oxford.

GERHARD MÜLLER: *Der Aufbau der Bücher II und VII von Platons Gesetzen*. Pp. 109. Weida i. Thür.: Thomas und Hubert, 1935. Paper.

IT is rare and refreshing to find a German scholar paying more attention to the work of a Briton than to that of his own countrymen. And if only on the ground of the close consideration he bestows on England's commentary on the *Laws* (Bks. II and VII) Dr. Müller's dissertation deserves a welcome. It consists of a close examination, section by section, of the argument of the two books, each section being followed by a series of notes on points of detail, mainly textual and grammatical. The main general object is to bring out (as against Ivo Bruns) the close connexion, and consistency of doctrine, which exists between II and VII, and between both these and I.

The most serious novelty is an excursus (of some 6 pp.) in which it is argued that a section of Bk. V (732D-734E) is spurious—possibly an addition by Philip of Opus. The same hand is suspected at 659E5-660A8. Amongst other deletions suggested (besides approval of most of England's) are *ὁποῖ' αἴτια*, 656E2; *θαροῦντα* and *μέλη*, 657A7; *τῷ τοῦ δικαίου*, 663C3; *φθούς* and *περί τ. τελευτήσαντας*, 800E2; *ἐκ . . . πόνων*, 805A7; *οὐδὲ . . . δεσποτιῶν*, 808D4. As M. has taken no account of mere translators (such as Prof. Taylor and myself) he has failed to notice that some of his points have been anticipated (e.g. *ἡμῶν* for *ἡμῶν*, 661C8; *καθαπερεὶ . . . ἴσσει*, 790E2; *μίμημα*=Urbild, 668B2, etc.). *μηχανήν* for *ἡδονήν*, 649E1, is attractive; more so than the *οὐδὲν ἦπρον* (for *οὐδ' ἡ τῶν*) of W. Theiler at 824A2, where I think the best cure is to excise the next three words, *δ. π. ἔχουσα*.

Space forbids further comment on details, but the book as a whole may be commended to the attention of students as a sound and careful piece of work.

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

Aristotle, *On the Soul*; *Parva Naturalia*; *On Breath*. With an English translation by W. S. HETT, M.A. Pp. xii+520. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR. HETT's translation is generally lucid and free from the curiosities of language affected by some translators of Aristotle. A few passages are very obscure (cf. 407a10 ff., 429b10 ff., 440a31 ff.); this is due partly to extreme faith in Bekker's punctuation, partly to imperfect analysis of the argument. There is a general lack of precision, and the prevalence of errors (whether of omission or of misconception) suggests inadequate revision. A few examples follow: 403a15 *τὸ εὐθύ* 'straight line'; 404b24 *τὰ εἶδη αὐτὰ* 'their forms'; 411b20, 26, 27 force of *ὡς* missed; 416a3 *καὶ τῷ παντί* 'in every case'; 438b16 *ὡς λαμπτήρ τινα* 'as by a lamp-screen'; 440a1 *δι' ἡνπερ αἰτίαν* 'because'; 456a30 *τίνων γενομένων . . . ἐπελθεῖν* 'discuss certain happenings'; 463b8 *τοῦ ἀποβῆναι τὸ ἐνύπνιον* 'the fact of the dream appearing'; 471a24 *κἂν ἐκεῖνα δ'* . . . *ὄντα* 'those too which live out of water.' *παρὰ* is mistranslated at 458b15, 462a29, 463a9; and in the *De Spiritu* *νεῦρον* is regularly 'nerve.'

The following are actual misprints or discrepancies between text and translation: 406b14, print comma after *κινεῖ*; 430b18, for 'line' read 'time'; 437a9, *ἀκοή*; 441b7, *διὸ* is retained but not translated; 448b25, read *ταῦτά*; 450a13, *τοῦ νοουμένου* of text cannot mean 'the thinking faculty'; p. 322 marg., for 454a read 455a; 481a12 (*ὥσπερ* . . . *θερμόν*), the translation seems to follow Ross, who deletes *καὶ* and reads *περιέχον* for *περιεχόμενον*; 481b27, the text has *πόρος* (Jaeger), the translation 'account' from the vulgar *λόγος*; 482a6, the translation implies Ross's emendation *αὐτὸ <δ> ἡρεῖται*; 483a11, print colon after *ἀναπνευστικῇν*.

The text follows Bekker closely. Rejection of his readings is duly recorded, but without any indication of the authority followed. The

introductions (except that to the *De Anima*, which contains a convenient summary) are too superficial to have much value. There are a few useful explanatory notes, whose number might well have been increased. A more thorough system of cross-references would have been helpful to the student of Aristotle.

HUGH TREDENNICK.

University of Sheffield.

ALINE LION, D.Phil. (Oxon.): *Ἀνάμνησις* and the *a priori*. Pp. 39. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Paper, 2s. 6d.

DR. LION'S interesting pamphlet is too full of matter to be adequately treated in a short review. Broadly speaking, she is attempting to find a common doctrine in Plato and Kant; but her efforts are complicated by the fact that the doctrine which she seeks to find may be described, I think not unfairly, as the doctrine of Gentile. She rather disarms criticism by admitting—on p. 31—that 'long intercourse with the work of subsequent philosophers may be responsible for the line taken and for the conclusion to which it has led.' This seems to me to be true. She does not distinguish sufficiently between the doctrines taught by the philosophers in question and the implications which she finds in these doctrines. And I must confess that especially as regards Plato I find her interpretation unconvincing.

Dr. Lion is concerned primarily with the affinity between Plato's doctrine of the *εἶδη*, as set forth in the *Phaedo*, and Kant's doctrine of the *a priori*. In maintaining that there is such an affinity—if one adds the necessary qualifications—she is certainly correct. But she appears to me to go altogether too far in finding something like Kant's Copernican revolution already implicit in Plato. Curiously enough, she makes Plato's doctrine of *ἀνάμνησις* correspond to Kant's doctrine of noumena. One would have thought it corresponded rather—*mutatis mutandis*—to Kant's doctrine of the mental origin of the *a priori*.

The great merit of Dr. Lion's pamphlet is that it treats philosophy as a living thing, and it is itself very much alive.

The pamphlet contains too many misprints.

H. J. PATON.

University of Glasgow.

*A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*, edited by HENRY A. SANDERS.

Pp. viii+127; 3 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Cloth, \$3.00. THIS is the indispensable supplement to Kenyon's edition of the N.T. Chester-Beatty papyri. Kenyon gave the text of ten leaves of the Pauline Epistles. It was quickly discovered that six leaves at Michigan University were from the same MS, and in the winter of 1932-3 Michigan became possessed of twenty-four more. The original MS, formed of a single quire in codex form, can be shown to have contained from 100 to 104 leaves. Dr. Sanders here gives the text of all the pages recovered. At the foot of each page is given a collation of the

*textus receptus*. This modest apparatus does not rival Kenyon's collection of variants, but critics will be glad to have the text without delay, and will agree that we should wait awhile before a fuller study is attempted. More leaves may yet be produced. (Dr. Sanders limits the number of possible fresh leaves to 43: surely this is a mistake in arithmetic.) Among the more notable variants in this MS is the position of the Doxology, Rom. xvi. 25-27, at the end of xv. This is a new factor in a complicated question, but in view of the early evidence for a shorter recension of the Epistle ending at xiv, it may be questioned whether it justifies Dr. Sanders' somewhat hasty conclusion that the new codex gives us the original of which all other forms of the text are corruptions.

Cambridge.

J. M. CREED.

G. MANTEUFFEL (adi. L. Zawadowski et C. Rozenberg): *Papyri Varsovienses*. Pp. xii+69; 4 plates (photographic facsimiles). Warsaw: Universitas Varsoviensis, Acta Facultatis Litterarum, 1935. Paper.

THESE texts are mostly not of great importance. Most are very imperfect, some mere scraps, several of them hardly worth publishing. But there are a few good pieces; the best are 5, an extremely interesting fragment of a library catalogue, and 10, a loan on security with accompanying bank-*διαγραφή* and *προσάγγελία*. Such fragmentary papyri offer peculiar difficulties to the decipherer and call for special skill and experience. Unfortunately the texts here published show all too clearly that neither the editor nor his assistants possessed this experience. Many readings are obviously wrong, some impossible; and the misgivings aroused by a perusal of the printed texts are not allayed by a glance at the facsimiles. In 12, for example, *ξ (ἔτους) Καίσαρος τοῦ Κυρίου* is inconceivable in A.D. 158; the actual reading is *α* (or *β* ?) (*ἔτους*) *Οὐὲρ πασιανού* (the month is *φ. ὥφι*, not *φαμε(νὼθ)* as M.). In l. 10 of the same, *Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου* is impossible; the characters look like *διὰ τοῦ αἰγ(ου)*. The same delusion that Antoninus Pius could be referred to as *Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος* recurs in 19 (l. 8; in l. 5 read [*καὶ θεὸν μέγιστον* 'Οσσεμαντίνου]). In 10, col. iii, the editor creates the impossible title of bibliophylax *Ταβίρων καὶ Ἀρσινόων ν(ομῶν)*; the actual reading of ll. 3-4 is *Ἰσιδῶρω καὶ Ἀνταρίωνι τῷ καὶ Ἀρσινόῳ γεγυμ(νασιαρχηκόσι) βιβλ(ιοφύλαξι) ἐνκ(τήσεων) Ἀ[ρσ]ῖ[ν]ο[υ] (ου)*. This papyrus is not from a *τόμος συγκολλήσιμος*; the three documents were stuck together because they were stages in a single transaction. In 2 an erroneous reading of the letters E and B in ll. 7 and 8 as symbols of actors is alone responsible for the title 'Fragmentum mimi.'

It is useless to multiply instances. Such mistakes, very pardonable in beginners, are made by all novices in papyrology; but it is a pity that the editor, whose industry and enthusiasm deserve all praise, did not consult a more experienced papyrologist before venturing into print.

British Museum.

H. I. BELL.



HEBER D. CURTIS and FRANK E. ROBBINS: *An Ephemeris of 467 A.D.* Pp. 24. (Publications of the Observatory of the University of Michigan, Vol. 6, No. 9.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Paper.

WE are here given photographs of three fragments of papyrus, with the Greek text and a translation, restoring the lacunae to the best of the editors' powers, of what is so far as I know the only ancient ephemeris preserved to us in which the daily longitudes of Sun, Moon, and five planets are exhibited. It is accompanied, as it deserves, with a full commentary to which the Michigan University astronomer and the Michigan University papyrologist have contributed an astonishing degree of patience, learning, and skill, which I can appreciate all the better since I was privileged to see a transcript made at an earlier stage of the work. It cannot be doubted that the editors have both dated the ephemeris and fitted together its fragments correctly. They find that it is constructed according to the precepts contained in certain manuscripts of Theon's shorter commentary on the Manual Tables of Ptolemy, but they have failed to discover that the places exhibited are actually computed from those tables, which were edited along with the precepts by Halma in 1823-5. In an otherwise accurate study the editors have made an unfortunate erroneous calculation of the longitude of the Moon's descending node, the Dragon's tail of the ancients, as computed from modern tables, and this has led to an impossible suggestion on the meaning of the word ΕΚΛΙΠΤΙΚΑ, which can, I believe, mean nothing more than that the Moon was near the ecliptic. The precepts seem to instruct the compiler to write τὰ ἐκλειπτικά whenever the Moon is within twelve degrees on either side of the node. But this is a trifle compared with what has been achieved. It is no small reason for gratification that an astronomer has been found who is capable of dealing with such material. J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

Oxford.

FERNAND CHAPOUTHIER: *Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse. Etude d'iconographie religieuse.* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 137.) Pp. viii+380; 15 plates, 67 illustrations in text. Paris: Boccard, 1935. Paper.

THE author of this excellent monograph explains in his preface that his attention was drawn some years ago to the many problems connected with the Kabeiroi, with whom the Dioskouroi are frequently associated both in art and in Hellenistic theological speculations. Finding no satisfaction in any of the current explanations of the mysterious Samothracian cult, nor discovering any clue in his own investigations on the site, he has limited himself to a detailed study of the history, origins and developments of one art-type, the group consisting of a goddess flanked by twin male figures. There is no doubt that in Sparta, at all events, these are Helen and her brothers; but no example of this triad takes us further back than about the third century B.C., far too

late to tell us anything of the origins of the group. The author conjectures (p. 223, *sqq.*), but his proofs are the opposite of cogent, that the genesis of this motif is to be sought in the representation, occasionally found in the East, of a deity, sometimes the Great Mother, borne on a pair of smaller mounted figures. Much likelier to be right are his speculations, this time supported by good archaeological evidence, concerning the development and adaptation to other cults of the group. In general, his theorizing is moderate, marked by common sense, and accords with his own remark (p. 338, note 4) 'Entre ces deux points de vue extrêmes, j'ai voulu justifier une position intermédiaire.'

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Cicero, *The Verrine Orations*, with an English translation by L. H. G. GREENWOOD. Vol. II (Part II, Books III, IV and V). Pp. vii+694. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press), 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

MR. GREENWOOD'S translation is vigorous, incisive, generally elegant, often felicitous, but it has some curious weaknesses. Grave errors are these: III. 63, 'because he could not keep his purpose hidden from Verres' (*quod habere clausa non potuerit sua consilia de Verre*); III. 126-7 *passim*, 'the poverty of the farmers' (*aratorum penuria*); IV. 65, 'they pulled off the wrappings and stood waiting' (*involutis reiectis constituerunt*); V. 15, 'lately took the trouble to write to you' (*recenti negotio ad te litteras misit*). In III. 195 and V. 168 the sense is ruined by Mr. Greenwood's ignoring the past jussive construction. Perverse translations are: III. 11, 'do not be anxious lest my handling of them should prove tedious and monotonous' (*quam varie et quam copiose dicantur exspectare nolite*); III. 64, 'has been too weak to withstand' (*non potuerit perferre*, where the context shows that the meaning is 'could not tolerate'); IV. 26, 'for behold, Roman citizenship has not saved its possessor from such a penalty' (*cum videant ius civitatis illo supplicio esse mactatum*). The point of some doubtful Ciceronian humour is quite missed in V. 82 and 132. Is 'fringed toga' (V. 36) correct for *toga praetexta*? Is *tunica pulla* really a 'brown' tunic (IV. 54)? *Phalerae* may have been 'bosses' (IV. 29), but they were surely not 'breastplates' (III. 185). How can 'footprints' appear in a document (V. 148)? Possibly 'deserted' for *reliquis* (V. 69) is deliberate. The translator follows Long, probably rightly, in postulating a noun *explosor* in III. 184, but a note is needed. There are a few oddities of English, e.g. III. 9, 'that we should find him plundering more of our allies' cities than Mummius plundered our enemies' cities. Misprints are numerous—III. 13, 122, IV. 17, 20 (translation), III. 193, 200, 209, IV. 90, 110, V. 106, 113 (text). Sentences are omitted in the translation in V. 101 and 141.

In fairness to Mr. Greenwood, it must be said



that many admirable points could be cited. But in a translation sponsored as this is the debit side of the account cannot be overlooked, and it is surprisingly heavy.

R. G. AUSTIN.

*University of Glasgow.*

HJALMAR LINDGREN: *Studia Curtiana*. Pp. xv + 102. Upsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1935. Paper.

THIS dissertation will have to be taken into account in any new edition of the text of Quintus Curtius. It does not aim at a comprehensive survey of style and syntax, but is rather a collection of parallel passages involving various peculiarities of style such as unnecessary repetition and pleonasm, various types of ellipsis, the use of simple for compound verbs, etc., and the passages are grouped in chapters according to the peculiarity involved. In the last chapter a number of miscellaneous passages are dealt with.

The author's intention is to defend the mss. against emendations. Passages from other writers, as well as from Curtius, are cited in evidence, and the argument is often reinforced by the observation that the emendation would destroy the rhythm of a clausula.

In face of the parallels cited in each case, it is impossible to doubt that the defence of the mss. is made good. The effect of the work as a whole is to show how dangerous it is to make even the easiest and most obvious alteration of the ms. text without an exhaustive study of the style of an author. In many cases editors might have been convinced that emendation was unnecessary even by referring to Kühner-Stegmann. In no case does the retention of the ms. reading involve the necessity of 'construing through a brick wall.'

This short volume is a very useful contribution not only to the study of Curtius, but to Latin linguistic studies in general.

E. C. WOODCOCK.

*University of Manchester.*

Lucii Ampelii *Liber Memorialis*: edidit ERWIN ASSMANN. Pp. xxxii + 96. Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Paper, RM. 5.20 (bound, 5.80).

As the last edition of Ampelius, that by Wölflin, appeared as long ago as 1854, the time for a new edition had certainly come, though the book is unimportant in itself. Only one manuscript, of S. Benignus at Dijon, appeared to have survived the Middle Ages, and this apparently no longer exists, though it might turn up at Leningrad, where at least one manuscript from the same old library survives. The only manuscript copy now known to exist is a seventeenth-century transcript of the Dijon MS at Munich. This Assmann has carefully recollated, and he has been able to correct and add to Wölflin's reports of its readings. He has also studied what has been written about Ampelius in the interval. The preface is a long and careful piece of work. As the date of Ampelius has been debated, I give my opinion, for what it is worth, that he wrote in the second

century. It is a pity to disfigure the text with such spellings as *columpnae* (p. 18, l. 13), as the author cannot have used these. On the *Ioues* (c. 9) Tert. *Apol.* c. 14 might also have been given. I should state that the edition is furnished with abundant parallels from ancient literature, and that it antiquates all others.

*University of Aberdeen.*

A. SOUTER.

Saxonis *Gesta Danorum*, primum a C. Knabe et P. Herrmann recensita, recognoverunt et ediderunt J. OLRIK et H. RAEDER. Tomus I textum continens. Pp. lii + 609. Strong linen-covered boards, in case. Tomus II: Indicem verborum confecit F. BLATT. Fasc. i, pp. x + 126 (a-dissideo). Paper. Copenhagen: Levin og Munksgaard, 1931 and 1935. Kr. 36 and 10.

THE writer commonly called Saxo Grammaticus, by whom Hamlet is first named, has an interest for the classical scholar because of the wonderful purity of his diction and the fact that he imitated Valerius Maximus and other early writers. The Danes have something of the same pride in him that we have in the Venerable Bede. Only fragments of his work exist in manuscript, and editors have to depend in the main on printed editions, for the purification of the text of which a good deal of emendation has been necessary. All previous efforts have been surpassed by the present edition, which is not less distinguished in externals than it is in scholarship. The printing and paper leave nothing to be desired. A preface and introduction are followed by an index of abbreviations and a bibliography. The main body of the volume consists of the text with a double apparatus, the first containing passages in earlier writers imitated by Saxo, and the second the usual record of variants. The first volume concludes with an index of editions and translations, an index of proper names, and addenda and corrigenda. The name of Franz Blatt, editor of the Latin *Acta Andreae et Matthiae* (Giessen, 1930), is a sufficient guarantee that the laborious task of compiling the *index verborum* is in excellent hands. It is intended to publish the rest of this index in 1936 and 1937, and these parts will be followed by the last of all, containing explanatory notes. A work of which any nation might be proud.

*University of Aberdeen.*

A. SOUTER.

Docteur DONNADIEU: *Fréjus, le port militaire du Forum Julii*. Pp. 27; 34 illustrations. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 10 fr.

TWENTY-SEVEN pages of graceful prose contain most of the statements about the naval port of Fréjus already made by Dr. Donnadieu in his work *La Pompée de la Provence*. If, indeed, the larger work contained a better exposition of the matters summarized here, the slight treatment would be easier to ignore. But it does not, and the case as stated is full of weakness. According to Dr. Donnadieu, Fréjus was a village under Julius, a port under the Triumvirate, and a colony under Octavian. This view neglects the juristic implications of *forum*, and states, rather than demonstrates, the dis-

tion between the later stages. If the port came before the colony, where were its landward defences? The line shown is formed of retaining walls overlooking the dockyards, and offering a remarkable opportunity for setting them ablaze. It short, it is difficult, on present evidence, to conceive of the town and docks as separate tactical units. Their separation, however, by the unmilitary obstacle, bears out the view that the port was exclusively naval, a contention still further supported by the absence of maritime guilds in the epigraphic record of the town. The organization of the port remains obscure. The so-called Prefect's house may have been such, but the identification is not supported by the analogy cited (pl. 22), while the barracks remain undefined, though they should be distinctive enough. Again, the so-called Baths, Hospital and Stadium are indistinguishable from the buildings of a country estate. These are the main features of a site whose interest is only enhanced by criticism. There are some useful plans, if used with a magnifying-glass; but the collotypes have not disguised the bad photographs from which they are made. In particular, the air-photographs compare most unfavourably with the fine work done by the French Air Force in Syria.

Armstrong College, I. A. RICHMOND.  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

L. C. WEST: *Roman Gaul. The Objects of Trade*. Pp. xi + 191. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Boards, 7s. 6d.

IN this volume Dr. West applies to the study of the products of Roman Gaul the meticulous thoroughness which characterised his books on Spain and Britain (noticed in *C.R.* XLV, p. 35, and XLVI, p. 140). It would be impossible to convey more detailed information in a short space, and even those who have made a special

study of this province will be grateful to the author for showing them how much material is at the disposal of the historian. Dr. West has ransacked all literary sources from Caesar to Gregory of Tours for information concerning the natural products and industries of Gaul, and fully realizes the importance of epigraphic and archaeological material. His book contains chapters on the imports into Gaul from Italy and the provinces, and gives valuable information on the presence of foreigners in Gaul. There is a full bibliography (which, however, contains no reference to Grenier's *Archéologie gallo-romaine* or to C. E. Stevens' *Sidonius Apollinaris*), and if the system of reference to it by means of letters is a little irritating to the reader, it enables Dr. West to reduce the size of his book. At the end of each chapter is an elaborate table giving the places of origin of objects found in Gaul, the places where they were discovered, and the sources of information.

The book must be regarded as mainly a source of material, and would have made more interesting reading if the author had allowed himself to generalize. The short introductory section is well below the level of the rest of the work, and contains statements on Roman rule in Gaul which no historian can accept. We are told that in the Gallic tribes 'self-government was wholly lacking,' that 'the officials, as in the corresponding units in Egypt,' were 'sent down from above,' and that the collection of taxes in Gaul was the work of the officer commanding the army. The colonization of Narbo is attributed to the Gracchi, and Arelate is said to have been founded 'for commercial reasons.' The bibliography would have looked better if the date of publication of the books mentioned in it had been given.

G. H. STEVENSON.  
University College, Oxford.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

### GNOMON.

XI. 9. SEPTEMBER, 1935.

*The Swedish Cyprus Expedition, 1927-1931*. Vol. 1 by E. Gjerstad, J. Lindros, E. Sjöqvist, A. Westholm [Stockholm: The Swed. Cyprus Exped., 1934. Part 1, pp. 1 + 578, 217 illustrations, 16 maps; Part 2, 155 plates] (Schweitzer). Sch. notes some faults but looks forward to further volumes of an epoch-making book. A. Erman: *Die Religion der Ägypter* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. xvi + 465, 10 plates, 186 illustrations] (Schubart). Learned, though some of the judgments show lack of sense of proportion. J. Hundt, *Der Traumglaube bei Homer* [Diss. Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1935. Pp. 112] (Böhme). Some valuable interpretation, but H. tries to prove too much. W. K. C. Guthrie: *Orphism and Greek Religion* [*C.R.* XLIX. 68] (Kern). K. cannot always agree, but welcomes the book very warmly. J. Horst: *Proskynein* [Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1932. Pp. xv + 327] (Schwenn). Useful though

sometimes lacking in precision. C. Bailey: *Religion in Virgil* [*C.R.* XLIX. 162] (Burck). An individual approach leading to results which are mostly unacceptable to the reviewer. H. Kruse: *Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche* [*C.R.* XLIX. 95] (Alföldi). Clearly thought out and expressed. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* ed. G. Kittel, Vol. 1 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933. Pp. xi + 793, 24] (H. Kittel). A promising first volume. F. J. Dölger: *Antike und Christentum*, vols. 3 and 4 [Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1932-4. Each vol. pp. 320, 16 plates] (Weigand). W. illustrates the wide interest and importance of the periodical. S. Wide und M. P. Nilsson: *Griechische und römische Religion* [*C.R.* XLVII. 150] (Pfister). N.'s revision of W.'s remarkable book (1912) ensures its value for a long time. 1. W. Stettner: *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern* [*C.R.* XLIX. 37]; 2. J. R. Watmough: *Orphism* [*ibid.*]; 3. L. Herrmann: *Du Golgotha au Palatin*

[Brussels: Lamertin, 1934. Pp. 295] (Nock). 1. Competent, but incomplete in some respects. 2. Confused and useless. 3. Industrious, but unprofitable. M. Marchesini: *Omero* [C.R. XLVIII. 191] (Bowra). The essay on the Odyssey is unfinished and indeterminate; M.'s account of the Iliad is interesting, but she is too much influenced by modern standards. E. Skard: *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe* [C.R. XLVI. 233] (Schaefer). Sk. collects much material, but makes no real advance. O. Bardenhewer: *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* vol. 5 [Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1932. Pp. xi + 423] (Balogh). The last volume of an exceptionally useful book. H. Lietzmann: *Zeitrechnung . . . für die Jahre 1-2000 nach Christus* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. 137 (Sammlg. Göschén)] (Bickermann). Very useful.—Bibliographical Supplement 1935 Nr. 4 (down to August 31).

## XI. 10. OCTOBER, 1935.

P. Zancan: *Il Monarcato Ellenistico nei suoi elementi federativi* [C.R. XLIX. 187.] (Schubart). The best account in existence. F. Granier: *Die makedonische Heeresversammlung* [Munich: Beck, 1931. Pp. xiv + 206] (Ferguson). The first systematic account of the rights and activities of the executive assembly of the Macedonians. *Der Gnomon des Idios Logos*, Part 2: Commentary by Waldemar Graf Uxkull-Gyllenband [Berlin: Weidmann, 1934. Pp. 115] (Rostovtzeff). R. notes many points of disagreement, but stresses the fundamental importance of the commentary. L. Zancan: *Ager Publicus* [Padua: Milani, 1935. Pp. viii + 114] (Gelzer). Two studies, (1) groundwork for a history of the Ager Publicus; (2) penetrating examination of the relevant part of the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. H. Siber: *Zur Entwicklung der römischen Prinzipalverfassung* [Leipzig: Hirzel, 1933. Pp. 53] (Ensslin). Concise, clear, and suggestive. *Gli Studi Romani nel mondo*, vol. 1 [Bologna: Cappelli, 1934. Pp. 206 illustrated] (Sieveking). Eleven lectures taking the form of reports. S. only comments on those by archaeologists. H. Lietzmann: *Geschichte der Alten Kirche. 1: Die Anfänge* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1932. Pp. vii + 323] (Achelis). The first of four volumes by the leader of the new school of ecclesiastical historians. E. Peterson: *Εἰς Ὁρός* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1926. Pp. viii + 346] (Lohmeyer). P. leaves questions unanswered, but his work will be an indispensable basis for future research. G. J. D. Aalders: *Tertullianus' Citaten uit de Evangelien en de oud-Latijnische Bibel-Vertalingen* [C.R. XLVII. 152] (Kroymann). Useful work, but the controversy cannot be settled until all the books of the Bible have been similarly examined. K. Staritz: *Augustins Schöpfungsglaube . . .* [Breslau: Korn, 1931. Pp. 161] (Koch). Not very satisfactory. K. Svoboda: *Les idées esthétiques de Plutarque* [Brussels, 1934. Pp. 29] (Schmid). Confirms and amplifies the views expressed in Christ-Schmid 2,528. T. Christofferson: *Bemerkungen zu Dion von Prusa* [Lund: Gleerup,

1934. Pp. 33] (Castiglioni). The promise of this book makes its author's premature death deplorable. Ovidius vol. 3 fasc. 2: *Fastorum libri VI Fragmenta* ed. F. W. Lenz [C.R. XLVI. 275] (Köstermann). L. is in many ways better than Frazer, but future editors will need to combine the evidence adduced by each. W. A. Oldfather, H. V. Canter, B. E. Perry: *Index Apuleianus* [C.R. XLIX. 156] (Haftter). Very valuable.—Obituary notice of Wilhelm Schulze by Fr. Secht.

## CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXIX, NOS. 1-3. OCTOBER, 1935.

C. Knapp, *Experientia docet*. The proverb not apparently in any classical author, but Tac. *Hist.* v. 6 *has cuius legendi usum . . . experientia docuit*. T. W. Valentine, Vergil, *Aen.* vi. 637-75. The presupposition here is irreconcilable with the *σῶμα σῆμα* theory of 724-51, and is in line with primitive Christian ideas. H. E. Mierow, *The Trend of Euripidean Criticism*. The unfavourable view, since Schlegel, of E.'s extreme realism has been modified by an increasing recognition of his romantic element. But the attempt, since Willamowitz, to explain E.'s development in terms of periods is of doubtful value. E. displays his peculiar quality, the strange combination of bitter realism and exquisite beauty, all through his career. There is no riddle in the *Bacchae* beyond the riddle of his own personality. L. R. Lind, *Un-Hellenic Elements in the Subject Matter of the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*. Many folk-tales and strange superstitions: an oriental emphasis on decorations, gems, etc.: Iranian conceptions, Aion-Chronos, Mithraic elements, the conflict of good and evil: nowhere in Greek does Dionysus appear in more decidedly Asiatic aspect. Id., *The Mime in Nonnus's Dionysiaca*. The epic contains examples of various literary genres, including the mime, 19. 198-225, 263-302, 30. 108-17. Id., *An Ancient Dred Scott Case*. Pseudo-Quint., *Declam.* cccxl. D. B. Kaufman, *Parallels*. For 'you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.' Mary Johnston writes notes on recent quotations from Horace and Vergil: Roman influence on the framers of the American constitution: a recent reversion to oxen for ploughing, etc. *Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals 1-111*.

REVIEWS.—Elizabeth H. Haight, *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets*, New York, 1932. The exposition of the poets is commendable: the discussion of Latin prose fiction is not convincing (A. F. Pauli). T. R. S. Broughton, *The Romanisation of Africa Proconsularis*, Baltimore, 1929. A convincing picture of the Roman genius for administration at work: unusual mastery of the ancient documents and modern literature (Id.). S. Casson, *Progress of Archaeology*, London, Bell, 1934. Arbitrary in selection of material, but the material is admirably given (W. D. Gray). Fr. von Oppeln-Bronikowski, *Archäologische Entdeckungen im 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1931. Less broad in scope than the above, and many omissions, but of considerable value (Id.).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Apfel** (H. V.) Literary Quotation und Allusion in Demetrius ΠΕΡΙ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑΣ und Longinus ΠΕΡΙ ΥΠΟΥΣΕΩΣ. Pp. ix + 134.
- Ashby** (T.) The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome. Edited by I. A. Richmond. Pp. xvi + 342; frontispiece, 24 plates, 34 figures, 7 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 63s.
- Bachtin** (N.) Introduction to the Study of Modern Greek. Pp. 86. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1935. Paper, 2s.
- Birley** (E.) Corbridge Roman Station (Corstopitum). Pp. 26; frontispiece and plan. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1935. Paper, 6d.
- Boak** (A. E. R.) Soknopaiou Nesos. The University of Michigan excavations at Dimé in 1931-32. Pp. xii + 47; 13 plates, 16 plans. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXXIX.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Cloth, \$2 50.
- Cesareo** (E.) De Statii duabus silvis. Pp. 32. Naples: Istituto Meridionale di Cultura, XIII. Paper.
- Constans** (L.-A.) Cicéron, Correspondance. Tome II. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 20 fr.
- Diamond** (A. S.) Primitive Law. Pp. x + 451. London etc.: Longmans, Green, 1935. Cloth, 25s.
- Dies** (A.) Platon, Oeuvres complètes, Tome IX. 1<sup>re</sup> Partie. Le Politique. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1935. Paper, 20 fr.
- Eberhart** (H.) Mitteilungen aus der Papyrus-sammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek. IV. Literarische Stücke (P. bibl. univ. Giss. 34-35). Pp. 36; photographs. (Schriften d. hessischen Hochschulen. Univ. Giessen, Jahrgang 1935, Heft 2.) Giessen: Kindt, 1935. Paper.
- Getty** (R. J.) The Lost St. Gall MS. of Valerius Flaccus. Pp. 33. (Aberdeen University Studies: No. 110.) Aberdeen: University Press, 1934. Paper.
- Gotschick** (A.) Probleme der frühgriechischen Plastik. Pp. 123; 6 figures. Prag: Czerny, 1935. Stiff paper.
- Hallard** (J. H.) Idylls of the Tweed. Pp. 47. Oxford: Blackwell, 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Hanell** (K.) Die Inschriftensammlung des Konstantinos Laskaris. Pp. 10. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1934-5, IV.) Lund: Gleerup, 1935. Paper, kr. 0.60.
- Henry** (P.) Recherches sur la Préparation évangélique d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius. Pp. xii + 143. (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences Religieuses, 1<sup>re</sup> Volume.) Paris: Leroux, 1935. Paper, 40 fr.
- Meecham** (H. G.) The Letter of Aristeas. A linguistic study with special reference to the Greek Bible. Pp. xxi + 355. Manchester: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Moss** (H. St. L. B.) The Birth of the Middle Ages, 395-814. Pp. xviii + 291; 8 plates, 10 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Neophilologus** XXI. 1. Groningen etc.: Wolters. Paper.
- Parker** (H. M. D.) A History of the Roman World from A. D. 138 to 337. Pp. xii + 402; 4 maps. (Methuen's History of the Greek and Roman World.) London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth, 15s.
- Pease** (A. S.) P. Vergili Aeneidos liber quartus. Edited by A. S. P. Pp. ix + 568. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, \$6 or 25s.
- Powell** (J. U.) e **Barber** (E. A.) Nuovi Capitoli di Storia della Letteratura greca. Traduzione dall'inglese di N. Martinelli. Pp. xv + 242. Florence: le Monnier, 1935. Paper, L. 15.
- Russell** (J. C.) and **Heironimus** (J. P.) The shorter Latin poems of Master Henry of Avranches relating to England. Pp. xxiii + 162. (The Mediaeval Academy of America, Studies and Documents, No. 1.) Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1935. Stiff paper, \$2.
- Schulte** (W. H.) Index Verborum Valerianus. Pp. 180. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, III.) To be had of the author, c/o Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa, for \$2.50. Paper, 1935.
- Schütze** (K.) Beiträge zum Verständnis der Phänomene Arats. Pp. 56. Dresden: Dittert, 1935. Paper.
- Thierfelder** (A.) Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Apollonius Dyscolus. Pp. 91. (Des XLIII. Bandes der Abh. d. ph.-hist. Kl. d. sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. Nr. II.) Leipzig: Hirzel, 1935. Paper, RM. 6.
- Tucker** (T. G.) The Agamemnon of Aeschylus translated. Pp. 63. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Valmin** (N.) Rapport préliminaire de l'expédition en Messénie, 1934. Pp. 52; 31 figures. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1934-5, I.) Lund: Gleerup, 1935. Paper, kr. 1.90.

Adams (C.)  
Adler's  
Albeggiani  
Alexander  
Seneca  
Allan (E.)  
Soul,  
Philop.  
153.  
204.  
mentar  
Allen's (C.)  
and E.  
Allen's (C.)  
Altheim's  
Amery's  
Amundsen  
(I), 221  
Anderton  
Andrew's  
XXIV  
Annali de  
Apfel's L  
Longin  
Arend's  
Aristoph  
Assmann  
Atkins' L  
Atkinson  
Austin (C.)  
Oratio  
Bailey (E.)  
of App  
Bailey's  
Balsdon  
Barber (C.)  
Kallim  
Barbu's  
Plutarch  
39  
Barnard  
Barrett's  
Barrow's  
Baty (C.)  
Baynes  
Goticus  
Beare (W.)  
Comedy  
Menaech  
Wilhel  
Bell (E.)  
181.  
Berthelo  
Bibliothec  
Blake's L  
Blakewell  
Bolaffi's  
Books R  
Bowra (C.)  
Der L  
typische  
der h  
MHAE  
Brady's  
Greeks,  
Brakman  
Breasted  
Brinton's  
Brown's



# INDEX

## I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Adams (S. M.)** Two plays of Euripides, 118  
**Adler's Suidae Lexicon** (III), 205  
**Albeggiani's Aristotele, La Poetica**, 67  
**Alexander's Notes and Emendations to the Dialogues of Seneca**, 40  
**Allan (D. J.)** on Spicer's *Aristotle's Conception of the Soul*, 21. On de Corte's *Le Commentaire de Jean Philopon sur le . . . 'Traité de l'Âme' d'Aristote*, 153. On Post's *The Vatican Plato and its Relations*, 204. On Schröder's *Galen in Platonis Timaeum commentarii fragmenta*, 205  
**Allen's (P. S.) Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi** (VIII) and *Erasmus: Lectures*, 36  
**Allen's (T. W.) Theognis**, 152  
**Altheim's Epochen der römischen Geschichte**, 86  
**Amery's The Stranger of the 'Ulysses'**, 44  
**Amundsen's Greek Ostraca in the Michigan Collection** (I), 228  
**Anderton's Into the By-ways**, 150  
**Andrew's Hector's Ransoming, a translation of Iliad XXIV**, 129  
**Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa**, 1  
**Apfel's Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius and Longinus**, 222  
**Arend's Die typischen Scenen bei Homer**, 90  
**Aristophron's Plato's Academy**, 40  
**Assmann's Ampelii Liber Memorialis**, 243  
**Atkins' Literary Criticism in Antiquity**, 73  
**Atkinson and Green's Graded Caesar**, 151  
**Austin (R. G.)** on Greenwood's *Cicero, The Verrine Orations* (II), 242  
**Bailey (K. C.)** on Partington's *Origins and Development of Applied Chemistry*, 239  
**Bailey's Religion in Virgil**, 233  
**Balsdon's The Emperor Gaius**, 146  
**Barber (E. A.)** on Pfeiffer's *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten*, 176. On Ferguson's *The Manuscripts of Propertius*, 234  
**Barbu's Les procédés de la peinture des caractères dans . . . Plutarque**, 32; his *Les sources et l'originalité d'Appien*, 39  
**Barnard's A First Latin Course**, 88, 201  
**Barrett's Gaisford Greek Verse**, 44  
**Barrow's A Selection of Latin Inscriptions**, 43  
**Baty (C. W.)** on Latin class-books, 89  
**Baynes (N. H.)** on Damerau's *Kaiser Claudius II Gothicus*, 148  
**Beare (W.)** on Johnston's *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy*, 27. On Moseley and Hammond's *Plautus: Menaechni*, 38. On Ernout's *Plaute* (III), 188. On Wilhelm's *De Codice B Plautino*, 207  
**Bell (H. L.)** on Curschmann's *Papyri Iandanae* (VII), 181. On Manteuffel's *Papyri Varsovienses*, 241  
**Berthelot's Festus Avienus, Ora Maritima**, 143  
**Bibliotheca Philologica Classica** (1933), 117  
**Blake's Epiphanius: de Gemmis**, 42  
**Blakeway (A.)** on Ollier's *Le Mirage spartiate*, 184  
**Bolaffi's Ludovici Areosti Carmina**, 150  
**BOOKS RECEIVED**, 47, 94, 161, 212, 246  
**Bowra (C. M.)** on Perrotta's *Saffo e Pindaro and Falter's Der Dichter und sein Gott*, 61. On Arend's *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer und Dornseiff's Nochmals der homerische Apollonhymnos*, 90. On Mette's *MHÄEN AFAN*, 155  
**Brady's The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks**, 206  
**Brakman's Miscella Quarta**, 43  
**Breasted's Ancient Times**, 173  
**Brinton's The Hunting of the Snarh (in Latin verse)**, 44  
**Brown's A Study of the Scipionic Circle**, 28  
**Bury (R. G.)** on Müller's *Der Aufbau der Bücher II und VII von Platons Gesetze*, 240  
**Bury's Sextus Empiricus** (II), 225  
**Butler (H. E.)** on Conway's edition of Virgil, *Aeneid I*, 232  
**Butler's The Fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid**, 89  
**Calder (W. M.)** on Cornford's *The Origin of Attic Comedy* and Rose's *Concerning Parallels*, 14. On Amery's *The Stranger of the 'Ulysses'*, 44. On Hunt and Edgar's *Select Papyri* (II) and Winter's *Life and Letters in the Papyri*, 72. On DeFerrari's *St. Basil, Letters* (IV), 154. Silius Italicus in Asia, 216  
**Cambridge Ancient History**, vol. x, 197; vol. of plates iv, 200  
**Campbell (A. H.)** on Lengle's *Römisches Strafrecht*, 157  
**Campbell (A. Y.)** Three restorations in Aeschylus, *Persae*, 50  
**Campbell's Horati Carmina Viginti**, 31  
**Carpenter's The Humanistic Value of Archaeology**, 16  
**Gary (M.)** on Schur's *Sallust als Historiker*, 30. On Barbu's *Les procédés de la peinture des caractères dans . . . Plutarque*, 32. On Barbu's *Les sources et l'originalité d'Appien*, 39. On Berthelot's *Festus Avienus, Ora Maritima* and Oldham's *The Age and Origin of the Lower Rhône*, 143. On Niccolini's *I Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe*, 145  
**Cases ancient and modern**, 168  
**Casey's The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria**, 41  
**Casson (S.)** on Wace's *An Approach to Greek Sculpture*, 183  
**Casson's Progress of Archaeology**, 129  
**Cauneas**, 166  
**Cavallin's Literaturhistorische und textkritische Studien zur Vita S. Caesaris Arelatensis**, 42  
**Cesareo's Propertius: Elegie scelte**, 81; his *Cicerone: Lettere scelte*, 208  
**Chambry's Platon, La République** (iv-x), 66  
**Chapouthier's Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse**, 242  
**Charisteria Gustavo Przyschocki a discipulis oblata**, 40  
**Charlesworth (M. P.)** on Sauter's *Der römische Kaiser-kult bei Martial und Statius*, 139  
**Christie (J. T.)** on some school-books, 15, 201. On Giusti's *Antologia America*, 152  
**Classical Association** (meetings etc.), 2, 49, 213  
**Classical Review: back numbers for disposal**, 117  
**Classical Weekly** summarized, 45, 91, 158, 245  
**Cloché's La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 308 av. J.-C.**, 21  
**Colson (F. H.)** on Goodenough's *By Light, Light*, 230  
**Colson and Whittaker's Philo** (v), 154  
**Columba's Ricerche storiche** (I), 174  
**Constans' Cicéron: Correspondance** (I), 189  
**Conway's edition of Virgil, Aeneid I**, 232  
**Conway and Johnson's edition of Livy** (IV), 192  
**Coon's biography of W. Warde Fowler**, 1  
**Cornford (F. M.)** A new fragment of Parmenides, 122  
**Cornford's The Origin of Attic Comedy**, 14  
**Craig (J. D.)** on Mountford's *The Scholia Bembina*, 137  
**Creed (J. M.)** on Kraeling's *A Greek Fragment from Tatian's Diatessaron*, 206. On Sanders' *A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*, 241  
**Curschmann's Papyri Iandanae** (VII), 181  
**Curtis and Robbins' An Ephemeris of 467 A.D.**, 242  
**Dalmeyda's Longus: Pastorales**, 135  
**Damerau's Kaiser Claudius II Gothicus**, 148  
**Davison (J. A.)** on Kolář's *Die Logaöden*, 63  
**de Corte's Le Commentaire de Jean Philopon sur le Troisième Livre du 'Traité de l'Âme' d'Aristote, 153  
**DeFerrari's St. Basil, The Letters** (IV), 154**



- Delatte's *Les conceptions de l'enthousiasme chez les philosophes présocratiques*, 17; his *Le troisième livre des Souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon*, 134
- della Valle's *Saggio su la Poesia dell' Antigone*, 203
- del Re's *Il dialogo Sull' Estinzione degli Oracoli di Plutarco*, 39
- den Dulk's *Kpōis*, 202
- Denniston (J. D.) Note on Greek particles, 12
- de Ruyt's *Charun, démon étrusque de la mort*, 24
- de Vis' *Epiphanius: de Gemmis*, 42
- de Zulueta's *Supplements to the Institutes of Gaius*, 209
- Diller's *Wanderarzt und Aitiologie*, 65
- Dodds (E. R.) on Theiler's *Porphyrus und Augustin*, 71.  
On Willms' *EIKON* and Henry's *Plotin et l'Occident*, 179
- Donnadieu's *Fréjus*, 243
- Donnelly's *Cicero's Milo*, 208
- Dornseiff's *Nochmals der homerische Apollonhymnos*, 90
- Dougan and Henry's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque* (II), 84
- Drerup's *Der Humanismus*, 75
- Duff (A. M.) on Fairclough's *Virgil* (II), 138. On Witlox' *Consolatio ad Livian*, 155
- Duff (P. W.) on Seckel and Kübler's *Gaius, Institutiones*, and de Zulueta's *Supplements to the Institutes of Gaius*, 209
- Dunbabin (R. L.) Notes on Lewis and Short (II), 9
- Dymock and others' *Nineteen Echoes and a Song*, 210
- Earp (F. B.) on Murray's *The Seven against Thebes*, 130
- Edel's *Aristotle's Theory of the Infinite*, 153
- Ehrenberg's *Ost und West*, 229
- Ernout's *Plaute: Comédies* (III), 188
- Euripides MSS reproduced, 213
- Fairclough's *Virgil* (II), 138
- Falter's *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern*, 61
- Fanning's *Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Liberrum . . . Libri Sex*, 42
- Ferguson's *The Manuscripts of Propertius*, 234
- Festa's *I frammenti degli Stoici antichi* (II), 204
- Field (G. C.) on Taylor's *The Parmenides of Plato*, 18
- Finnegan (T.) Note on Virgil, *Aen. vii. 626 f.*: 57
- Fischer's *Nereiden und Okeaniden in Hesiods Theogonie*, 37
- Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Reis' Teubner texts of Cicero's *Brutus* and *Orator*, 141. On Conway and Johnson's edition of Livy (IV), 192
- Forbes' *Notes on the History of Ancient Roads and their Construction*, 87
- Fordyce (C. J.) on Hafiter's *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache*, 26. On Hooper's *M. Porcius Cato and M. Terentius Varro on Agriculture*, 156. On Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* (I), 188
- Forster (E. S.) on Mayor's *Seventy Odes of Horace translated*, 79. On Andrew's *Hector's Ransoming, a translation of Iliad XXIV*, Marris' *The Iliad of Homer translated*, and translations by Way, 129. On *Nineteen Echoes and a Song*, 210
- Fotheringham (J. K.) on Curtis and Robbins' *An Ephemeris of 467 A.D.*, 242
- Fraenkel (E.) *Memoir of Wilhelm Schulze*, 217
- Fraenkel's *Rome and Greek Culture*, 50
- Friedländer's *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht*, 62
- Gaffiot's *Dictionnaire Illustré Latin-Français*, 35
- Gardner (R.) on *Opuscula Archaeologica* (I, i), 237
- Gaselee (S.) on Vroom's *Le psaume abécédair de saint Augustin*, and 'Carmina Hoeufftiana' and other prize compositions, 44. On some Neo-Latin writers, 150. On Hutton's *The Greek Anthology in Italy*, 152. On Silk's *Saeculi noni auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae Commentarius*, and some compositions and translations, 194
- Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (new edition, 5 and 6), 178
- Getty (R. J.) on Mozley's edition of Valerius Flaccus, 83
- Gigon's *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit*, 133
- Giles (A. F.) on Barrow's *A Selection of Latin Inscriptions*, 43. On Altheim's *Epochen der römischen Geschichte*, 86. On *The Cambridge Ancient History* (X), 197
- Giles (Peter), obituary notice, 165
- Giusti's *Antologica America*, 152
- Gnomon summarized, 46, 92, 158, 211, 244
- Gomme (A. W.) on Kahrstedt's *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*, 19. On Lavell's *A Biography of the Greek People*, 75
- Goodenough's *By Light, Light*, 230
- Gray and Jenkins' *Latin for Today*, 88
- Greek particles, 12
- Greenwood's *Cicero, The Verrine Orations* (II), 242
- Griffith (G. T.) on Hoffmann's *Rom und die griechische Welt im 4. Jahrhundert*, 25
- Griffith's *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, 136
- Gulick's edition of Athenaeus (V), 68
- Gundert's *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf*, 176
- Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Watmough's *Orphism*, 37. On Krueger's *Quaestiones Orphicae*, 69. On Tierney's *The Parodos in Aristophanes' Frogs*, 203
- Guthrie's *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, 68
- Haarhoff's *Die Kortverhaal van die Grieks en Romeins*, 165
- Haackforth (R.) on von Schelha's *Dion*, 77. On Kesters' *Antisthène de la Dialectique*, 223
- Hafiter's *Untersuchungen zur allateinischen Dichtersprache*, 26
- Halliday (W. R.) on Bailey's *Religion in Virgil*, 233
- Hamilton (W.) on Delatte's *Les conceptions de l'enthousiasme chez les philosophes présocratiques*, 17. On Wifstrand's *EIKOTA* (III), 90. On Langerbeck's *ΔΟΞΙΣ ΕΠΙΠΤΕΜΙΗ*, 132. On Gigon's *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit*, 133
- Hanell's *Megarische Studien*, 76
- Hardie (C. G.) on Albeggiani's *Aristotele, La Poetica*, 67. On Hinman's *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Aristotle* and Apfel's *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Demetrius and Longinus*, 222
- Harrison (E.) on Gulick's *Athenaeus* (V) and Jones' *Strabo* (VIII), 68. On Wölfflin's *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 157. *IIANEION*, 172. On Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* (new edition, pt. 8), 226
- Haussleiter's *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike*, 204
- Hawes' *Citizens of Long Ago*, 157
- Hennig's *Die Geographie des homerischen Epos*, 60
- Henry's *Plotin et l'Occident*, 179
- Herodotus Lexicon projected, 117
- Hesperia (IV. 2), 165
- Hett's *Aristotle: On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, 240
- Hettich and Maitland's *Latin Fundamentals*, 89
- Higham (T. F.) on Moore's *The Art of Love*, 192
- Highet (G.) on Thomson's *The Art of the Logos*, 177. On Donnelly's *Cicero's Milo*, 208
- Highet's *An Outline of Homer*, 151
- Hignett (C.) on Panitz' *Mythos und Orakel bei Herodot*, 203
- Hinman's *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Aristotle*, 222
- Höeg's *La Notation Ekphonétique*, 207
- Hoeufft prize poems, 44; notice to competitors, 117
- Hoffmann's *Rom und die griechische Welt im 4. Jahrhundert*, 25
- Holmes' *Chancellor's Latin Verse*, 44; his *Gaisford Greek Verse*, 194
- Hooper and Ash's *M. Porcius Cato and M. Terentius Varro on Agriculture*, 156
- Horace bimillenary, 1
- Horace's debt to Greek literature, 109
- Horna (K.) Note on Epicurus (*Gnomologium Vaticanum*, No. LXXXI), 58

- Housman (A. E.)** on J. Wight Duff and A. M. Duff's *Minor Latin Poets*, 78. *Fragmenta poetarum*, 166
- Hude's** *Xenophontis Commentarii*, 90
- Hudson-Williams (T.)** King bees and queen bees, 2
- Hudson-Williams' A Short Introduction to Comparative Grammar**, 239
- Hunt and Edgar's Select Papyri (II)**, 72
- Hutton's The Greek Anthology in Italy**, 152
- Irwin-Carruthers' Latin for Schools**, 151
- Johnston's Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy**, 27
- Jones' (H. L.)** edition of Strabo (VIII), 68
- Jones (J. H.)** The dramatic date of Varro, *R.R. II.*: 214
- Jones' (W. H. S.)** edition of Pausanias (IV), 224
- Kahrstedt's Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen**, 19
- Kamal's Quelques éclaircissements éparés sur mes Monuments Cartographiques Africae et Aegypti**, 174
- Kesters' Antisthenes de la Dialectique**, 223
- Keyssner's Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus**, 220
- Kiefer's Sexual Life in Ancient Rome**, 207
- King bees and queen bees**, 2
- Kirchner's Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum**, 227
- Kitto (H. D. F.)** on Snell's *Bacchylidis carmina*, 17. On Koláf's *De dactylo-epitritis*, 221
- Koláf's Die Logaöden**, 63; his *De dactylo-epitritis*, 221
- Köster's Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens**, 22
- Koestermann's** edition of Tacitus, *Annals I-VI*, 32
- Kraeling's A Greek Fragment from Tatian's Diatessaron**, 206
- Krueger's Quaestiones Orphicae**, 69
- Labowsky's Die Ethik des Panaitios**, 191
- Laidlaw (W. A.)** Note on *tam magnus*, 59
- Lake's Dated Greek Minuscule MSS. (I, II)**, 180
- Langerbeck's ΔΟΞΙΣ ΕΠΙΠΤΣΜΗ**, 132
- laquearia**, 233
- Laurat's Sallust**, 231
- Laurand's Cicéron**, 190
- Lavagnini's Aloisiae Sigeae . . . Satyra sotadica**, 150
- Lavell's A Biography of the Greek People**, 75
- Legg's** edition of St. Mark in Greek, 206
- Leider's Der Handel von Alexandria**, 154
- Lengle's Römisches Strafrecht bei Cicero und den Historikern**, 157
- Les Etudes classiques** (1935, 1), 1
- Lewis and Short**, notes on, 9
- Lewis and Styler's Foundations for Greek Prose Composition**, 88
- Liddell and Scott's A Greek-English Lexicon** (new edn., pt. 8), 226
- Lindgren's Studia Curtiana**, 243
- Lindsay's I am a Roman**, 43
- Lion's Ἀνάμνησις and the a priori**, 241
- Lister (H.)** on some class-books, 88
- Livingstone (R. W.)** on Drerup's *Der Humanismus*, 75.
- On Vinaver and Webster's Renan: Prière sur l'Acropole**, 91
- Lockwood's (D. P.) A Survey of Classical Roman Literature**, 25, 136
- Lockwood (J. F.)** on Gaffiot's *Dictionnaire Illustré Latin-Français*, 35
- Löfstedt's Syntactica (II)**, 144
- Lorimer (H. L.)** on Persson's *Eisen und Eisenbereitung in ältester Zeit*, 152. On Voigt's *Ueberlegung und Entscheidung*, 174. On *Revue des Etudes Homeriques (III)* and Fendlebury's *A Handbook to the Palace of Minos*, 202
- Lorimer (W. L.)** Note on Greek particles, 12. Note on Seneca, *Ep.* 47, 9: 59. Note on Euripides, *Hipp.* 347: 213
- Luce's Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (U.S.A., fasc. 1)**, 89
- Lucasole's carmen Hoeufftianum**, 44
- Lyde's Contexts in Pindar**, 202
- McDonald (A. H.)** on Latte's *Sallust*, 231
- Macdonald (G.)** on Robinson's *Sylloge Nummorum Græcorum (II)*, 22
- Mackail (J. W.)** on Shaw's *The Odyssey of Homer translated*, 219
- Mackay (L. A.)** on Villeneuve's *Horace: Epitres*, 155
- McKenzie (R.)** on den Dulk's *Kpâsis*, 202. On Nehrass' *Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidaurios*, 205. On Hudson-Williams' *A Short Introduction to Comparative Grammar*, 239
- madere*, 216
- Maguinness (W. S.)** on Brakman's *Miscella Quarta*, 43
- Malcovati's** edition of Cornelius Nepos, 142
- Mandra's The Time Element in the Aeneid of Vergil**, 139
- Manteuffel's Papyri Varsovienses**, 241
- Marchant (E. C.)** on Koestermann's edition of Tacitus, *Ann. I-VI*, 32. On Hude's *Xenophontis Commentarii*, 90. On Delatte's *Le troisième livre des Souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon*, 134. On Ollier's *Xénophon, La République des Lacédémoniens*, 222
- Marchesi's Arnobii Adversus Nationes**, 209
- Marris' The Iliad of Homer translated**, 129
- Marsh's A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B.C.**, 195
- Mattingly (H.)** on Breasted's *Ancient Times*, 173. On Balsdon's *The Emperor Gaius*, 146. On Reusch's *Der Kölner Münzschatzfund vom Jahre 1909*, 238
- Mayor's Seventy Odes of Horace translated into English verse**, 79
- Mazza's carmen Hoeufftianum**, 44
- Meiggs (R.)** on Rudolph's *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien*, 235
- mergae, merges*, 9
- Meritt and West's The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.**, 185
- Mette's MHAEN ATAN**, 155
- Milne (H. J. M.)** A new fragment of *Medea*, 14
- Minns (E. H.)** on Lake's *Dated Greek Minuscule MSS. (I, II)*, 180
- Mondolfo's L'infinito nel pensiero dei Greci**, 153
- Moore's (B. P.) The Art of Love (of Ovid)**, 192
- Moore (R. W.)** on Kiefer's *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*, 207
- Moore's (R. W.) Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax**, 200
- Morin's Firmici Materni Consultationes Zacchari et Apollonii**, 41
- Moseley and Hammond's T. Macci Plauti Menæchmi**, 38
- Motzow's Caesariana et Augusta**, 147
- Mountford (J. F.)** on Friedländer's *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht*, 62. On Höeg's *La Notation Ekphonétique*, 207
- Mountford's The Scholia Bembina**, 137
- Mozley's** edition of Valerius Flaccus, 82
- Müller's Der Aufbau der Bücher II und VII von Platons Gesetze**, 240
- Mure (G. R. G.)** on Wicksteed and Cornford's *Aristotle: Physics (II)*, 66
- Murray's** translation of *The Seven against Thebes*, 130
- Myres (J. L.)** on Hennig's *Die Geographie des homerischen Epos*, 60. On Warmington's *Greek Geography*, 91. On Columba's *Geografia e geografi del mondo antico* and Kamal's *Quelques éclaircissements*, 174. On Ehrenberg's *Ost und West*, 229
- Nehrass' Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidaurios**, 205
- Nestle's Griechische Religiosität von Alexander bis auf Proklos**, 70
- Newte's Chancellor's Latin Verse**, 194
- Niccolini's (G.) I Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe**, 145
- Niccolini's (L.) carmen Hoeufftianum**, 44
- Nicol (A. T.)** on Edel's *Aristotle's Theory of the Infinite* and Mondolfo's *L' infinito nel pensiero dei Greci*, 153
- Nisbet (E. G.)** on Laurand's *Cicéron*, 190
- Noble (P. B.)** on Walde-Hofmann's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Liefer. 8)*, 220
- Noek (A. D.)** on Colson and Whitaker's *Philo (v)*, 154. On van Herten's *Ἐπιστολά, Εὐλαβία, Ἰκέρως*, 155.
- On Usener and Wilamowitz' Ein Briefwechsel**, 158

- Norden's *Alt-Germanien*, 33  
 Nutting's *Comments on Lucan*, 208  
*osella*, 10  
 Oldfather, Canter, and Perry's *Index Apuleianus*, 156  
 Oldham's *The Age and Origin of the Lower Rhône*, 143  
 Ollier's *Le Mirage spartiate*, 184; his *Xénophon, La République des Lacédémoniens*, 222  
 Orlík and Raeder's *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, 243  
 Onians (R. B.) on Wehrli's *ΑΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΑΣ*, 175. On Keyssner's *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*, 220  
*opium*, 10  
*Opuscula Archaeologica* (I. i), 237  
 Owen (A. S.) on Untersteiner's *Sofocle: Aiace and Way's Aristophanes in English Verse* (II), 64. On della Valle's *Saggio su la Poesia dell' Antigone*, 203  
 Page (D. L.) on Lyde's *Contexts in Pindar*, 202  
 Page's *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, 131  
 Palmer (L. E.) on Russell's *The development of the art of language as exhibited in Latin and in English*, 34. On Moore's *Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax*, 200  
*pampinus*, 10  
 Panitz's *Mythos und Orakel bei Herodot.*, 203  
*papaver*, 10  
*Papyri landanae* (fasc. 7), 181  
 Papyrological Congress (Florence), 49, 117  
 Paratore's *Il Satyricon di Petronio*, 85  
 Parke (H. W.) on Griffith's *The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World*, 136  
 Parmenides, a new fragment, 122  
 Partington's *The Origins and Development of Applied Chemistry*, 239  
 Paton (H. J.) on Lion's *Ἀρδύριος and the a priori*, 241  
 Pearson (Alfred Chilton), obituary notice, 49  
 Peck (A. L.) on Diller's *Wanderarzt und Aitiologie*, 65. On Chambrý's *Platon, La République* (iv-x), 66  
 Pendlebury's *A Handbook to the Palace of Minos*, 202  
 Perrotta's *Saffo e Pindaro*, 61  
 Persson's *Eisen und Eisenbereitung in ältester Zeit*, 152  
 Pfeiffer's *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten*, 176  
*Philologische Wochenschrift* summarized, 93, 160  
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Cloché's *La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 308 av. J.-C.*, 21  
 Pighi's *carmen Hoëuffianum*, 44  
 Pindar and Simonides (fragments of an ancient commentary), 4  
 Platnauer (M.) on Nutting's *Comments on Lucan*, 208  
 Plato's *Astronomy*, 53  
 Pohlenz's *Antikes Führertum*, 28  
 Porteous (A. J. D.) on Gercke and Norden's *Einführung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (new edition, II. 5 and 6), 178  
 Post's *The Vatican Plato and its Relations*, 204  
*poticius*, 10  
 Powell (J. E.) Note on a peculiarity of syntax in Herodotus, 171  
 Powell (John Undershell), obituary notice, 49  
 Pratt's *A First Latin Course*, 201  
*propola*, 10  
*quadra*, 11  
 Raby (F. J. E.) on Lindsay's *I am a Roman*, 43  
 Rackham (H.) Version from Ronsard, 97. On Schäfer's *Ein frühmittelstoisches System der Ethik bei Cicero*, 29  
 Rand's *Studies in the Script of Tours* (II), 149  
 Rattenbury (R. M.) on Dalmeyda's *Longus: Pastorales*, 135  
*reclinis*, 11  
 Rehm and Vogel's *Exakte Wissenschaften*, 178  
 Reis' Teubner texts of Cicero, *Brutus and Orator*, 141  
 Reusch's *Der Kölner Münzschatzfund vom Jahre 1909*, 238  
*Revue des Etudes Homériques* (III), 202  
 Richards (G. C.) on Allen's *Erasmus: Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches and his edition of Erasmus, Letters* (VIII), 36  
 Richards' *Cicero: A Study*, 140  
 Richmond (I. A.) on *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. of plates iv, 200. On Donnadien's *Fréjus*, 243  
 Richmond (O. L.) on Cesareo's *Propertio: Elegie scelte* and Terzaghi's *Propertio: Elegie*, 81  
 Robertson (D. S.) on Schlumberger's *Les formes anciennes du chapiteau corinthien*, 37. On Charisteria Gustavo Przychocki a discipulis oblata, 40. On Gundert's *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf*, 176  
 Robin's *Latin Revision and Drill*, 201  
 Robinson's *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* (II), 22  
 Robson's edition of Arrian (II), 154  
*robur*, 11  
 Ronsard's *A son âme* in Latin hendecasyllables, 97  
 Rose (H. J.) on Sinclair's *A History of Classical Greek Literature*, 15. On de Ruyt's *Charun*, 24. On Norden's *Alt-Germanien*, 33. On Fischer's *Nereiden und Okeaniden in Hesiods Theogonie* and Stettner's *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern*, 37. On del Re's *Il dialogo Sull' Estinzione degli Oracoli di Plutarco*, 39. On Wellmann's *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos*, 40. On Guthrie's *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, 68. On Nestle's *Griechische Religiosität von Alexander bis auf Proklos*, 70. On Spargo's *Virgil the Necromancer*, 81. On Brady's *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks*, 207. On Chapouthier's *Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse*, 242  
 Rose's *Concerning Parallels*, 14  
 Rostovtzeff's *Città Carovaniere*, 39  
 Rouse's *Latin Stories*, 201  
 Rudolph's *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien*, 235  
 Russell's *The development of the art of language as exhibited in Latin and in English*, 34  
 Salmon (E. T.) Note on Ovid, *Tr. i. 11 15: 128*  
 Sandbach (F. H.) on Mandra's *The Time Element in the Aeneid of Vergil*, 139. On Festa's *I frammenti degli Stoici antichi* (II), 204. On Bury's edition of Sextus Empiricus (II), 225  
 Sanders' *A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul*, 241  
 Sauter's *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*, 139  
 Schäfer's *Ein frühmittelstoisches System der Ethik bei Cicero*, 29  
 Schlumberger's *Les formes anciennes du chapiteau corinthien en Syrie* . . . 37  
 Scholte's *Tertulliani De Testimonio Animae*, 41  
 Schröder's *Galen in Platonis Timaeum commentarii fragmenta*, 205  
 Schulze (Wilhelm), memoir, 217  
 Schur's *Sallust als Historiker*, 30  
 Scoti, 12  
*sebum*, 12  
 Seckel and Kübler's *Gaius: Institutiones*, 209  
 Sedgwick (W. B.) on Paratore's *Il Satyricon di Petronio*, 85  
 Sellschopp's *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, 60  
*Series episcoporum Romanae ecclesiae*, 194  
 Sforza (F.) The problem of Virgil, 97  
 Shaw's *The Odyssey of Homer translated*, 219  
 Shewan (A.) on Carpenter's *The Humanistic Value of Archaeology*, 16  
 Silius Italicus in Asia, 216  
 Silk's *Saeculi noni auctoris in Boetii Consolationem Philosophiae commentarius*, 194  
 Sinclair (T. A.) on Sellschopp's *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, 60. On Allen's *Theognis*, 152. On Hawes' *Citizens of Long Ago*, 157  
 Sinclair's *A History of Classical Greek Literature*, 15  
 Skahill's *The Syntax of the Variae of Cassiodorus*, 41  
 Skeat (T. C.) on Westermann and Hasenoechl's *Zenon Papyri* (I), 31. On Amundsen's *Greek Ostraca in the Michigan Collection*, 228  
 Skutella's *S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim*, 156

- Smith (W. K.)** Horace's debt to Greek literature, 109  
**Smith, McLean, and Keyes** *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae* (II), 210  
**Snell's** *Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*, 17  
**Solmsen (F.)** on Page's *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy*, 131  
**Soutar (A.)** on Alexander's *Notes and Emendations to the Dialogues of . . . Seneca*, 40. On Casey's *Clement of Alexandria: Excerpta ex Theodoto*, Morin's edition of Firmicus Maternus, Skahill's *The Syntax of the Varias of Cassiodorus*, and Scholte's *Tertullian, De Testimonio Animae*, 41. On Wordsworth and White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (II, iv), Blake and de Vis' *Epiphaniae: De Gemmis*, Cavallin's *Studien zur Vita S. Caesaris Arelatensis*, and Fanning's *Mapheus Vegius* (I-III), 42. On Rand's *Studies in the Script of Tours* (II), 149. On Oldfather, Canter, and Perry's *Index Apuleianus* and Skutella's *S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim*, 156. On Waszink's *Index Verborum et Locutionum quae Tertulliani De Anima libro continentur*, 157. On Marchesi's *Arnobii Adversus Nationes*, Weinberger's *Boethii Philosophiae Consolationis libri V*, and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae* (II), 209. On Assmann's *Ampelii Liber Memorialis* and Olrik and Raeder's *Saxonis Gesta Danorum*, 243  
**Spargo's** *Virgil the Necromancer*, 81  
**spatula**, 12  
**Spicer's** *Aristotle's Conception of the Soul*, 41  
**Spranger's** (J. A.) reproductions of MSS of Euripides, 213  
**Stanier's** *Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets*, 151  
**Stefanini's** *Platone* (II), 204  
**Stettner's** *Die Seelenwanderung bei Griechen und Römern*, 37  
**Stevens (C. E.)** on Forbes' *Notes on the History of Ancient Roads*, 87  
**Stevens (P. T.)** *ἸΠΟΤΕΡΑΙΟΣ* and *ΤΕΤΕΡΑΙΟΣ*, 125  
**Stevenson (G. H.)** on West's *Roman Gaul, the Objects of Trade*, 244  
**Stone (C. G.)** on Richards' *Cicero: A Study*, 140  
**Stone (W. A.)** Notes on Pindar, 123  
**Stuart Jones (H.)** on Adler's *Suidas Lexicon* (III), 205  
**SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS**, 45, 91, 158, 211, 244  
**Syme (R.)** on Marsh's *A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 B.C.*, 195. On Motzo's *Caesariana et Augusta*, 147  
**tam magnus**, 59  
**Tarelli (C. C.)** Cases ancient and modern, 168  
**Tarn (W. W.)** on Köster's *Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Seewesens*, 22. On Welles' *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, 23. On Rostovtzeff's *Città Carovaniere* and Thackeray and Marcus' *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities* (v-viii), 39. On Leider's *Der Handel von Alexandria*, 154. On Westlake's *Thessaly in the fourth century B.C.*, 186. On Zancan's *Il monarca ellenistico*, 187  
**Tarrant (D.)** on Stefanini's *Platone* (II), 204  
**Tate (J.)** on Atkins' *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, 73  
**Taylor (A. E.)** A note on Plato's astronomy, 52  
**Taylor's** *The Parmenides of Plato*, 18  
**tergere** with ablative of separation, 57  
**Terzaghi's** *Propertius: Elegie*, 81  
**testudo**, 233  
**Thackeray and Marcus' Josephus: Jewish Antiquities** (v-viii), 39  
**The Year's Work in Classical Studies**, 2, 213  
**Theiler's** *Porphyrios und Augustin*, 71  
**Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae** (II), 210  
**Thiersch's** *Artemis Ephesia*, 230  
**Thomson's** (J. A. K.) *The Art of the Logos*, 177  
**Thomson (J. O.)** on Robson's *Arrian* (II), 154  
**Tierney's** *The Parodos in Aristophanes' Frogs*, 203  
**Tillyard (H. J. W.)** on Wagner's *Carmina Horatii selecta . . . ad modos aptata*, 80  
**Tod (M. N.)** on Hanell's *Megarische Studien*, 76. On Kirchner's *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*, 227  
**transliteration** from the Greek, 165  
**Trazzi's** *carmen Hoesuffianum*, 44  
**Tredennick (H.)** on Hett's *Aristotle: On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*, 240  
**Untersteiner's** *Sofocle: Aiace*, 64  
**Ure's** *Aryballoi and Figurines from Rhitsona*, 182  
**Usener and Wilamowitz' Ein Briefwechsel, 158  
**van Herten's** *Ἐποικελα, Ἐὐδάβεια, Ἰκέρης*, 155  
**Varro: dramatic date of R.R. ii**, 214  
**Villeneuve's** *Horace: Epitres*, 155  
**Vinaver and Webster's** *Renan: Prière sur l'Acropole*, 91  
**Virgil, the problem of**, 97  
**Voigt's** *Überlegung und Entscheidung*, 174  
**von Scheliha's** *Dion: die platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien*, 77  
**Vroom's** *Le psaume abécédaire de St. Augustin et la poésie latine rythmique*, 44  
**Wace (A. J. B.)** on Aristophron's *Plato's Academy*, 40. On Ure's *Aryballoi and Figurines from Rhitsona*, 182. On Thiersch's *Artemis Ephesia*, 230  
**Wace's** *An Approach to Greek Sculpture*, 183  
**Wade-Gery (H. T.)** on Meritt and West's *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.*, 185  
**Wagner's** *Carmina Horatii selecta . . . ad modos aptata*, 80  
**Walde-Hofmann's** *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (new edition, 8), 210  
**Warburg Institute**, 2, 165  
**Warrington's** *Greek Geography*, 91; his *Remains of Old Latin* (I), 188  
**Wason (C. R.)** on Casson's *Progress of Archaeology*, 129  
**Waszink's** *Index Verborum et Locutionum quae Tertulliani de Anima libro continentur*, 157  
**Watmough (J. R.)** on Haussleiter's *Der Vegetarismus in der Antike*, 204  
**Watmough's** *Orphism*, 37  
**Way's** *Aristophanes in English Verse* (II), 64; his *Hesiod translated, The Homeric Hymns . . . in English verse, The Hymns of Callimachus with the Hymn of Cleanthes in English verse, Speeches in Thucydides and Funeral Orations translated*, 129  
**Webster (T. B. L.)** on Luce's *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (U.S.A. fasc. 1), 89  
**Webrli's** *ΔΑΘΕ ΒΙΩΣΕΑΣ*, 175  
**Weinberger's** *Boethii Philosophiae Consolationis libri v*, 209  
**Weller's** *carmen Hoesuffianum*, 44  
**Welles' Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period**, 23  
**Wellmann's** *Marcellus von Side als Arzt und die Koiraniden des Hermes Trismegistos*, 40  
**Wells' Gaisford Greek Prose, 44  
**Wenkebach and Pfaff's** *Galerii in Hippocratis Epidemiarum Libros I et II*, 205  
**West's** *Roman Gaul, the Objects of Trade*, 244  
**Westermann and Hasenoeherl's** *Zenon Papyri* (I), 38  
**Westlake's** *Thessaly in the fourth century B.C.*, 186  
**Whattmough (J.)** Letter on *The Prae-Italic Dialects*, 45  
**White's** *Novum Testamentum Latine* (II, iv), 42  
**Whittick (G. C.)** on Winbolt's *The Neptune and Minerva Stone, Chichester*, 210  
**Wicksteed and Cornford's** *Aristotle: Physics* (II), 66  
**Wifstrand's** *EIKOTA* (II), 90  
**Wight Duff (J.)** on Lockwood's *A Survey of Classical Roman Literature*, 25, 137. On Brown's *A Study of the Scipionic Circle and Pohlenz's Antikes Führertum*, 28. On Labowsky's *Die Ethik des Panaitios*, 191  
**Wight Duff (J.) and A. M. Duff's** *Minor Latin Poets*, 78  
**Wild's** *Chancellor's Latin Prose*, 194  
**Wilhelm's** *De Codice B Plautino*, 207  
**Williamson (S. C.)** Note on Virgil, *Georg. i. 193-6*: 216  
**Willms' EIKON** (I), 179  
**Winbolt's** *The Neptune and Minerva Stone, Chichester*, 210  
**Winnington-Ingram (R. P.)** Note on Aeschylus, *Eum. 674-80*: 7. Notes on two passages of Horace, 127****



- Winter's *Life and Letters in the Papyri*, 72  
**Withington (E. T.)** on Wenkebach and Pfaff's *Galen* in *Hippocratis Epidemiarum Libros I et II*, 205  
 Witlox' edition of *Consolatio ad Liviam*, 155  
 Wölfflin's *Ausgewählte Schriften*, 157  
**Wood (E. J.)** on Dougan and Henry's *Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque* (II), 84. On Malcovati's edition of Cornelius Nepos, 142. On Constans' *Cicéron: Correspondance* (I), 189. On Cesareo's *Cicerone: Lettere Scelte*, 208  
**Woodcock (E. C.)** on Löfstedt's *Syntactica* (II), 144. On Lindgren's *Studia Curtiana*, 243  
**Woodward (A. M.)** on Jones and Wycherley's *Pausanias*, 224  
 Wordsworth and White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (II. iv), 42  
 Wormald's *Latin Prose Composition and Sensim* (III), 89  
**Wright (T. E.)** on Campbell's *Horati Carmina Viginti*, 31  
**Wycherley (R. E.)** Note on Thucydides iv 48 4: 57  
 Wycherley's companion volume to Pausanias, 224  
 Wyllie's *Gaisford Greek Verse*, 44  
 Wynne-Finch's *Fracastor*, 150  
**Zuntz (G.)** Pindar and Simonides: fragments of an ancient commentary, 4  
 Zancan's *Il monarca ellenistico*, 187

## II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

- Aeschylus *Ag.* 263: 14. *Eu.* 674-80: 7. *Pers.* 156-68, 628-32, 674-6: 50  
 Ammianus Marcellinus xviii 2 15: 33  
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 338 f.: 171  
 Aristotle *H.A.* 553a: 2. *De An., Parv. Nat., Spir.* passim: 240  
 Arrian *Epict. Diss.* iii 22: 4. *Ind.* viii 11: 4  
 Athenaeus (xi, xii) 464a, 475a, 541e, etc.: 68  
 Bacchylides passim: 17  
 Basil *Letters* (CCXLIX-CCCLXVIII) passim: 154  
 Callimachus (fragments and *διγρήσεις*), 176  
 Cato *de agri cult.* passim: 156  
 Cicero *Fin.* ii 34, iii 16, etc.: 29. *Tusc. disp.* passim: 84. *Brutus, Orator* passim: 141. *de div.* ii 40 84: 166. *Letters* passim: 189. *In Verr.* II. iii-v passim: 242  
 Cornelius Nepos passim: 142  
 Diogenes Laertius vii 165: 204  
 Donatus *uit. Verg.* 10: 167  
 elegia in *Maecenatem* i 131 f., ii 7-10, etc.: 78 f.  
 Einsiedeln *eclogues* i 22 ff.: 172  
 Ennius ap. Non. 472 5: 166  
 Epicurus *Gnomologium Vaticanum* lxxxii: 58  
 Euripides *El.* passim: 120. *Hipp.* 347: 12 f., 213; 1057-62, 1086-92: 14; 1283-1466: 118. *Med.* 1057-62, 1086-92: 14. *Ph.* 446 ff.: 1.  
 Gaetulicus ap. Prob.: 167  
 Herodotus i 70 2, iii 87, vi 69 4, ix 82 1: 171  
 Horace *Carm.* passim: 31. *Epist.* i 19 32-3: 127. *A.P.* 10-12: 114; 286, 113. *Sat.* i 6 40: 127  
 Livy xxvi-xxx passim: 192  
 Lucan passim: 208  
 Lucilius ap. Non. 278 5-8: 166  
 N.T. Matthew ix 2, 5; Mark ii 5; Luke v 20, 23; John ix 6: 168  
 Ovid *Fast.* iii 556: 2. *Trist.* i 11 15: 128  
*Pap. Berol.* 13875: 4  
*Pap. Iand.* Fasc. 7: 181  
 Parmenides ap. Pl. *Tht.* 180d etc.: 122  
 Pindar O. 13 98, P. i 77, N. 7 70, 8 21, 9 46, I. 4 45, 5 38, 6 3: 123-5  
 Plato *Lg.* 822a: 54; 824a, etc.: 240. *Prm.* passim: 18. *R.* 530b: 53. *Smp.* 173d: 13. *Tht.* 180d: 122. *Ti.* 416c: 56  
 Plautus *Aul.* 512: 11. *Bacch.* 123: 10. *Poen.* 1018-20: 9  
 Pliny N.H. xviii 296-7: 9; xxxvi 22: 183  
 Poetae Latini Minores passim: 78  
 [Prob.] *comm. in Verg. Georg.* i 229: 167  
 Propertius passim: 81  
 Publilius Syrus 52, 301, 397, 414, 505, 537, 559, 607, 656: 78  
 Quintilian *I.O.* xii 10 75: 167  
 Seneca *Dial.* 6 3 3: 40. *Epist.* 47 9: 59. *N.Q.* vi 2 8: 168  
 Simplicius in *Phys.* 29 15, 143 8: 122  
 Sophocles *OC* 481: 14  
 Strabo xvii passim: 68; xvii 1 10: 172  
 Tacitus *Ann.* i-vi passim: 32  
 Tertullian *de test. animae* passim: 41  
 Theognis 19-23: 152  
 Thucydides i 44: 125; iv 48 4: 57  
 Vagellius ap. Sen.: 168  
 Valerius Flaccus passim: 82  
 Varro *R.R.* passim: 156; i 50: 9; iii *praef.*: 214  
 Virgil passim: 138. *Geo.* i 193-6: 216; ii 517: 10; iv 21, 88: 2. *Aen.* i passim: 232; vii 626 *sqq.*: 57  
 Xenophon *Comm.* passim: 90; iii passim: 135. *Oec.* vii 17, 32, 38, 39: 2, 3

## III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

δάσκατος, 58-9  
 διπρωπος, διπρωμος, 23  
 κρᾶσις, 202  
 κύκλος (naval), 23

οὐ δέ, μή δέ, 12  
 πᾶνιον, πάνειον, 172  
 πελεκυφόρας, 5  
 ποιήμα, ποιήσις, ποιητής, 110

προτεράϊος, 125  
 ὑστεράϊος, 125  
 φάσις, φέγγος, 202  
 φορηδόν, φορημένη, 57



tum Latino

usim (III),

na Viginti,

iv 48 4:

as, 224

ents of an

age.

v 20, 23;

6, I. 4 45,

. passim;

8od: 122.

1018-20: 9

559, 607,

Q. vi 2 8:

: 214

517: 10;

sqg.: 57

35. *Oec.*



# The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

*Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

*'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.*

**List of Books to be published, February, 1936**

## Latin

296. *Sidonius*. POEMS AND LETTERS. Translated by W. B. ANDERSON. Two volumes. Vol. I.

## Greek

307. *Aristotle*. MINOR WORKS. Translated by W. S. HETT. Three volumes. Vol. I. On Colours, On Things Heard, On Physiognomies, On Plants, On Marvellous Things Heard, Mechanical Problems, On Indivisible Lines, On Positions and Names of Winds.

305, 306. *Plutarch*. MORALIA. Translated by F. C. BABBITT. Fourteen volumes. Vols. IV and V.

311. *Sextus Empiricus*. Translated by R. G. BURY. Three volumes. Vol. III.

*Machines or Mind?* (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

*Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, 6s.*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

## SCHOOL BOOKS

By C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A., and  
R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.

**DEIGMA.** A First Greek Book. 4s. 6d. (Second and revised edition with a Summary of Accidence.) Contains two years' full work for boys or girls of fifteen. It is hoped that it will not be found wanting in any point of grammar usually included by British Universities in a final course for an ordinary degree.

**LIMEN.** A First Latin Book. 4s. Also in Two Parts. 2s. 6d. each. Teachers' Edition, including suggestions on the Oral Method, and dialogues for acting. 5s. 110th Thousand.

**ANTE LIMEN.** A New Latin Book for Younger Beginners, based upon *Limen*. Compiled, under the direction of the Authors, by R. H. REES. 2s. 31st Thousand.

**AD LIMEN.** Being Reading Lessons and Exercises for a Second and Third Year Course in Latin. 3s.

*Keys to all these books may be bought at the Publishers.*

JOHN MURRAY, 50 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

# THE AQUEDUCTS OF ANCIENT ROME

By Thomas Ashby  
Edited by I. A. Richmond  
Illustrated 63/- net

# ACTORS' INTERPOLA- TIONS IN GREEK TRAGEDY

By D. L. Page

10/- net

'... Any new enquiry will have to pay most careful attention to Mr. Page. If it does not, it will be doomed to fail. . . .'—*Classical Review*

# GREEK IDEALS AND MODERN LIFE

By Sir R. W. Livingstone

6/- net

'... This is a book which should be read and re-read by our leaders in Parliament, by clergymen, and by thinking citizens all the world over. . . .'—*Northern Whig*

# ARISTOPHANES

By Gilbert Murray

7/6 net

'... It is an enchanting book. . . .'—*Daily Telegraph*

'... A masterpiece. . . .'—*Time and Tide*

# RELIGION IN VIRGIL

By C. Bailey

15/- net

'... Offers rich addition to our understanding of Virgil and the religion of those days. . . .'—*Guardian*

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY

PRESS

